Teacher language policies in Finnish EFL classrooms

Lee Garner
Master's Thesis
Master's Programme in English Studies
Faculty of Arts
University of Helsinki
April 2021

HELSINGIN YLIOPISTO
HELSINGFORS UNIVERSITET
UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI

Tiedekunta – Fakultet – Faculty **Faculty of Arts**		Koulutusohjelma – Utbildningsprogram – Degree Programme **Master's Programme in English Studies**
Opintosuunta – Studieinriktning – Study Track **Teacher line**		
Tekijä – Författare – Author **Lee Garner**		
Työn nimi – Arbetets titel – Title **Teacher language policies in Finnish EFL classrooms**		
Työn laji – Arbetets art – Level **Master's**	Aika – Datum – Month and year **April, 2021**	Sivumäärä– Sidoantal – Number of pages **57 pages plus Appendices**

Tiivistelmä – Referat – Abstract

This MA thesis investigates teacher language policies in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classrooms in Finland. As one of the variables of historical approaches to teaching, language of instruction has had significant impact on theories of language learning. These approaches and theories have in turn affected current classroom language policies. The use of L1 (the community language; Finnish) in teaching contrasts with a trend towards English-only EFL classrooms. Such language policies are relevant because they are thought to influence language learning in the classroom. To investigate these issues, this thesis sets out to answer the following research questions: (1) What language policies do teachers report using in Finnish EFL classrooms? (2) How do teachers justify their language policies? (3) In what ways, if any, do teachers report breaking these policies?

To explore their subtle and multifaceted perspectives, 5 teachers from a Finnish secondary school were interviewed. Semi-structured interviews were recorded, transcribed and analysed through grounded theory in order to draw conclusions about their language choices, justifications and the perceived learning effects.

Findings illustrate that personal values, background influences and language learning intuitions justify an English-only approach, although teachers may still resort to L1 to ensure student understanding. Wide-ranging teaching objectives and classroom realities, however, lead to codeswitching as well as planned L1 use – for both teacher and student. Although the teachers described a transition towards reduced L1 use as students advance in age and language level, the requirements of curricula (including general and ethical objectives), the traditions of language teaching, student motivation and differentiation, as well as the role of L1 in textbooks and testing, all require the continued role of L1 in Finnish EFL classrooms. This thesis concludes that a strictly English-only lower or upper secondary school EFL classroom is unattainable.

Avainsanat – Nyckelord – Keywords
Language policy, English-only, EFL, codeswitching

Säilytyspaikka – Förvaringställe – Where deposited
Helsinki University Library

Muita tietoja – Övriga uppgifter – Additional information

Table of Contents

1. Introduction

This thesis investigates the role of language choice in the teaching of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) in a Finnish school setting. Language teaching often has at its core the idea that instruction should be effective and efficient. For this reason, different approaches and techniques have been developed over hundreds of years of language teaching. There are many polarised characteristics contained in these approaches—an emphasis on reading and writing over listening and speaking, commitment to accuracy or to communication, and so on. It seems to me that one of the fundamental, sometimes overlooked, questions to ask of an approach concerns the role that the target language takes in teaching and learning: is it more effective to teach using the target language or does this instead hinder learning?

1.1. Research Questions

The position of the target language (L2: the language being taught and learnt) in the classroom has been assessed in many ways over recent years. The influence of Stephen Krashen (e.g. 1982), in particular his language acquisition theory, has been recognised in language classrooms across the world, reinforcing a bias towards target language use. On the other hand, dissenting voices (following the influence of van Lier 1996 and Cook 2001, 2010) acknowledge the important role of the community language (L1: the assumed mother-tongue of teacher and learners) in foreign language teaching.

In order to explore this topic, the following research questions are used:

1. **What language policies do teachers report using in Finnish EFL classrooms?**
2. **How do teachers justify their language policies?**
3. **In what ways, if any, do teachers report breaking these policies?**

Current EFL approaches show awareness of the role of L1 as the historical foundation of language learning (i.e. the Grammar-Translation Method) as well as the gradual shift towards target language teaching (for example, the Communicative Approach). While target language use must make up some part of classroom discourse, the role of L1 may differ vastly from "an open and active role… with no restrictions," through its use as a "resource… clearly defined," to being "excluded completely" (Arnett 2013, 1). What makes these roles of particular interest

is that teachers "often base their assumptions and arguments largely on *intuitions* about best practices, anecdotal evidence, and personal classroom experience" (Levine 2003, 344, my emphasis). With such a diverse range of language uses and vague justifications, it is appropriate to consider teachers' language policies in Finnish EFL classrooms.

1.2. The Finnish EFL classroom

The role of English as a lingua franca in the global economy, in academia and also on the internet (Bayyurt and Akcan (eds.) 2015; Mauranen 2009, 2012) has driven a trend for the choice of English as students' first "A1" language (compulsory first foreign language) learnt in Finnish schools—over 90% of students study English as their A1 language (although in Swedish-language schools, the most common A1 language is Finnish). As of 2020, instruction in A1 language began in the spring term of grade one at the latest, meaning students start foreign language instruction at 7 years old (Finnish Ministry of Education, 1C /2019). In 2019, the total proportion of students studying EFL in Finland was 99.7% (ibid.). Students may add a second language (A2) in fifth or sixth grade and the compulsory B1 language (Finnish/Swedish, depending on school language) is started in sixth grade. A further language (B2) may be added in lower secondary school, in grades seven to nine (ibid).

The *National Core Curriculum for Basic Education (2014)* provides the foundation for compulsory education in Finland. Providing ethical values, general objectives, learning and subject objectives as well as criteria for assessment for students aged 6 to 16, the document is followed and interpreted by municipalities, schools and individual classroom and subject teachers. The curriculum is based on international human rights law, the Finnish constitution, and numerous laws specific to education. Although ultimately interpretable by schools and teachers with the right to work autonomously, the curriculum is binding as it is founded upon binding legislation.

The extent to which Finnish curricula impact on EFL language policies is based solely on single sentence entries. In the objectives of instruction for A syllabus English for grades 3-6 (section 14.4.3) and grades 7-9 (15.4.3), the curriculum for basic education states: "English is used whenever possible" (Finnish National Board of Education 2014). The upper secondary curriculum also contains suitably vague instruction: "the target language is used as much as possible" (i.e. Foreign languages, English, A syllabus, section 6.5.1; Finnish National Board of Education 2019). The curricula have been designed to influence educational, school and

classroom practices, and this should also apply to language policies used in EFL teaching. The accepted nature of municipality, school and teacher interpretation in reality makes this influence negligible.

In general, however, the Finnish curricula have recognised, supported and contributed to the development of effective language teaching:

> The National core curriculum for basic education (2014) states that the basic principle of language instruction at school is using language in different situations. The aim is to promote using and reflecting on language in order to strengthen pupils' language awareness as well as to promote the parallel use of different languages (ibid.).

Finland's success in the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) in the 2000s produced a number of justifications: Finland's schooling system is equal, egalitarian and comprehensive, teachers are highly educated and professional, schools are trusted to self-evaluate, early intervention is taken for students with learning difficulties, and there is a tradition of reading (see Jaatinen and Saarivirta 2014, 32). The outcomes for EFL are correspondingly positive. Using the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (Council of Europe, 2001), students reached level B1.1 for comprehension and level A2.2 for language production, notably higher than in any other foreign or second national language subject. English was also rated as the top language by students for proficiency, liking and usefulness (Finnish Education Evaluation Centre 2015). In another measure of EFL in Finland, respondents to a study by Leppänen (2007) stated that the status of English will continue to increase in Finland and that in some areas of life, English will be used more than Finnish. The study also reported that English is occasionally used instead of, alongside or even mixed with Finnish. The importance and emphasis on English would suggest that an efficient and suitable approach to classroom language choice is crucial.

Another factor influencing classroom language use is the mother-tongue of the students. According to the Ministry of Education, 6.8% of the Finnish population speak a language other than Finnish or Swedish as their mother tongue. In the last ten years in particular, this proportion has increased rapidly (1C /2019). The influence of EFL classroom language choice for these students is certainly relevant. How their mother-tongue is taken into consideration in the English classroom adds another perspective to this study (see Brevik and Rindal, 2020).

1.3. Teacher language policy

Research into language teachers' language policy, language use and codeswitching are not unusual (e.g. Edwards and Handrick, 1967; Turnbull and Arnett, 2002). In particular, studies of language classroom discourse investigated through the regimens of conversation analysis have gone some distance to document the ways in which languages are used and the meanings associated with this use (Üstünel and Seedhouse, 2005).

In contrast to classroom use, theories of language learning and teaching justify teachers' language policies in multiple ways. In this thesis, I hope to link these two perspectives. It is not enough to study what teachers really do or, indeed, what theories suggest. Rather, it is necessary to understand why teachers use their language policies, how language use is related to teaching values and approaches and what effect teachers believe their policies are having on teaching and learning.

In addition, we need to understand how teaching values, learning theory and even teaching and learning experience impact on teaching. As opposed to concentrating on theories of language teaching or classroom habits, I am interested in the real-life *justification* for teachers' language policies. The reasons why teachers change languages or make use of L1 is valuable evidence of current trends in teaching and learning. In addition, the ways in which teachers justify their language use comments on the relationship between language learning, teacher training and on pedagogy in general. Finally, it comments on their own teacher self-reflection and makes a contribution to research on teachers' professional development more broadly.

By *language policies*, I specifically refer to the languages chosen and used by teachers in their teaching (incorporating the four traditional language skills of speaking, listening, writing and reading) as well as the expected language use of students in the Finnish lower and upper secondary classroom, who have studied English for four to ten years. Cook uses the term "own language" to refer to "the language which the students already know, and through which (if allowed) they will approach the new language" (2010: xxii). In this study, the target language (L2) in question is English (EFL) and the "own language" (native language, mother tongue or community language) of the vast majority of students and teachers is Finnish (L1).

1.4. Teachers' language policies in Finnish EFL classrooms

In order to undertake this study, I decided to investigate in-service teachers at a school in which pre-service teachers are trained. In choosing a teacher-training school, my intention was to understand the perspectives of teachers who have reason not only to reflect on their own teaching regularly, but also those who may demonstrate and justify their methods and habits to future teachers. Perhaps, in the role of mentors, these teachers would assess their own methods frequently and be more aware of theoretical perspectives. In terms of present and future language teaching trends, exploring the viewpoints of these mentor teachers would allow some insight into their influence on the next generation of teachers. Using my research questions, I interviewed five teachers to discover what language policies they used in their classrooms and why they chose to do so. I also investigated the strictness of these policies and the circumstances in which exceptions to the policies were made (why should codeswitching take place?).

After recording and transcribing the interviews of the teachers, I approached analysis through grounded theory in order to draw conclusions about their language choices, justifications and the perceived effects. In this small case study, differences between perspectives will be highlighted in addition to their similarities. In discussing their testimonies, I will be able to compare my conclusions with other research on classroom language discourse and link these conclusions to language learning and teaching approaches.

The research questions yielded insights into how teachers perceive and justify their language use as well as the extent to which they feel in control of language choice. Rather than investigating the methods teachers actually use in the classroom, it is interesting to discover what methods they believe they use and how these methods are justified.

1.5. Overview

In chapter 2, I will evaluate the theoretical background to language teaching and learning and how this is related to the language policies of teachers in classrooms. Various theories of language, of learning, and of language learning will provide the foundation for scrutinising relevant theories of teaching, both past and present. Exploring trends in language teaching and in Finnish classrooms will shed light on the role of language policies in current EFL teaching in Finland. After explaining my methodology and analysis methods in more detail (chapter 3),

I will discuss the language policies, habits, values and justifications of the teachers in this case study (chapter 4) and go on to discuss the implications of these topics and their possible applications for language teachers and learners (chapters 5 and 6).

2. Literature review

The question of which language should be used to teach the target language is at the heart of theories of language, learning and teaching. Every perspective has its own justification for language policy and its role in the approach or theory represented. Indeed, as we shall see, polarised methods tend to polarise the role of language choice.

> Common to each method is the belief that the teaching practices it supports provide a more effective and theoretically sound basis for teaching than the methods that preceded it (Richards and Rodgers 2001, 1).

In this chapter, I will evaluate existing knowledge to give a theoretical background to my study. This will necessarily take in both theories of language and theories of learning to explore the assertion that classroom language use influences language learning. Linguists and teachers have built upon these theories in order to develop theories of teaching, called variously "approaches," "methods" and "techniques" (Anthony 1963, see below), as well as many other terms.

Language teaching has developed and undergone change, influenced by cultural changes as well as developments in theories of language and learning (e.g. Richards and Rodgers 2001). Below, a historical perspective provides background to the trends we may find in language teaching today. Along with these theories and approaches, it is also important to investigate any other influences that can be seen in the ELF classroom in Finland.

Finally in this chapter, I will assess whether language of instruction or interaction (here termed "language use") has a part to play in the development and trends of language teaching and whether the impact of language policy has been discovered in recent research on classroom language use.

2.1. Language Learning

2.1.1. Theories of Language

Notions of language learning and teaching are founded upon differing theories of language. Theories of language influence theories of learning which, in turn, influence approaches to teaching. Structuralist accounts of language dictate that elements of language, such as

phonological and grammatical units and operations as well as lexical items, are learnt as part of a system for the coding of meaning. Certain approaches to teaching, notably the Audiolingual Method, are derived from this view of language. Communicative approaches to teaching, on the other hand, are more suitable for a functionalist perspective of language, in which communicative meaning is the foundation. Finally, those teaching approaches that prioritise conversational exchanges and social relationships appeal to interactional theories of language (for an overview of theories of language, see Richards and Rodgers, 2001). These theories of language are influential on the theories of learning (2.1.2), language learning (2.1.3) and on the development and success of language teaching (2.2).

2.1.2. Theories of Learning

For an approach to language teaching to be successful, we must first define what "learning" might mean. Specific methods from teaching approaches are present in language theories of behaviourism (repetition, feedback), cognitivism (chunking, problem-solving, discussion) and constructivism (project and collaborative work) (e.g. Jaatinen and Saarivirta, 2014).

According to Kantelinen and Hildén (in Niemi et al. 2012, 164), language pedagogy in Finland has developed on

> principles of activity theory (Engeström, 1982) and cognitive theories of language learning (Kristiansen, 1998), sociocultural theories (Vygotsky, 1982; Lantolf and Thorne, 2006), and most recently on ecological theories of learning (van Lier, 2009) and a holistic understanding of language acquisition as multi-sited and multimodal process leading to greater capacity and empowerment of individuals (Ortega, 2009).

In practice, these influences can be seen in the development of an education system founded upon a national curriculum that promotes a

> new pedagogical culture in which learning is a holistic process in which different school subjects are not only taught separately but also integrated into a meaningful and coherent whole and in which students will have ownership and an active role in their learning (Finnish National Board of Education, 2014) (Välijärvi and Sulkunen in Niemi et al. 2012, 18).

Perhaps the most innovative aspect of recent national curricula has been an emphasis on the activity of students in their learning process. According to Kim and Yoon (2012), these "constructivist ideas that position the learner as an active participant" (xiii) can be traced back

to the influence of learning and developmental theories from Piaget (1930) and Vygotsky (1962).

The *National Core Curriculum for Basic Education* clearly states its "Conception of Learning." The values that make up this conception are based on students as active and influential participants in diverse but grounded education that encompasses goal-oriented learning-to-learn, critical, creative, social and emotional thinking, as well as reflection. This learning relies on interaction and is connected to both individual growth and community. Teachers provide encouraging guidance and appropriate feedback (see Finnish National Board of Education 2014, 17).

2.1.3. Theories of language learning

Theories of language learning describe the processes through which language learning occurs. But what might it mean to learn or master a language? According to John Carroll (1965), language aptitude is made up of: phonemic coding ability (sound-symbol relationships), grammatical sensitivity (the functions of words in sentences), inductive language learning ability (identifying relations between form and meaning) and rote learning ability (remembering associations, i.e. for vocabulary learning, between stimuli) (see Karahan in Inan-Karagul and Yuksel 2014, 4).

As we see below in chapter 2.3, teachers and linguists have long been preoccupied with the ways in which language aptitude might relate differently to L1 and L2. When language learning is described as language acquisition, the possible differences between first and second language acquisition are underplayed. Adherents to the critical period hypothesis argue that learning L1 and L2 are dissimilar because access to universal grammar is reduced when learning L2, not least because the brain changes significantly in the process of learning L1 and may directly affect L2 learning through transfer (see Menn 2017). The process of learning L2 is also different: "older children and adults have different cognitive abilities, emotions, motivations, and opportunities to learn than infants and young children" (ibid., 361). The contrast between L1 acquisition and L2 classroom learning is stereotypically stark.

Nonetheless, the similarities between L1 and L2 learning have influenced language teaching for centuries, reaching traction with the attempt by Stephen Krashen to unify L1 acquisition to L2 learning (see Krashen 1981 and 1985). For Krashen, the natural *acquisition* of language

(including L2) takes place subconsciously through communication. On the other hand, the conscious processing and formal study of language is *learning*. Although distinct enterprises (the acquisition-learning hypothesis), teaching can play a role in both acquisition and learning. A sufficient amount of comprehensible input must be provided which is interesting and relevant, as well as challenging (the input hypothesis). Even so, acquisition takes place in a natural order. Conscious learning may support this acquisition through its role in monitoring language output, ideally in a low-anxiety atmosphere (in which no affective filter is produced).

Krashen's theory of language learning specifically found its method in Terrell's Natural Approach (Krashen and Terrell, 1983). Within a stress-free environment which prioritises communication over grammar learning or error correction, the Natural Approach emphasises an abundance of comprehensible target language input and spontaneous (unforced) output. The impact of Krashen's hypotheses and Terrell's approach is still visible in the classroom today. As I illustrate in my findings (chapter 4), these ideas are consistent with inhibiting L1 use in L2 learning situations.

Distinct from specific approaches to teaching (outlined in chapter 2.2.2), language immersion is an implementation of language learning theory which shares foundations with Krashen's theory. In language immersion (also variously, total immersion, early immersion), all classroom time is spent with target language use; and language choice is not a consideration. In stark contrast to language classrooms (and here in the case of French language immersion in Canada),

> Immersion involves an intensive language approach with a switch of languages between the home and the school. Initially all or at least a very significant part of the curriculum is taught using the children's second language (French) as the language of instruction […] the distinguishing feature of immersion is that students learn language primarily through subject matter rather than by formal language teaching (Day and Shapson 1996, 1).

The existence of early total immersion in Finland, as well as bilingual education, language shower immersion and Content and Language Integrated Learning methods (CLIL), influences teachers' perspectives both on effective language teaching techniques as well as more fundamental questions about language learning and acquisition. As my findings illustrate below (chapter 4), there is an overlap between the techniques of total immersion and the values contained in the Finnish curricula: language learning is cultural and transversal; authentic

material and content (subject matter) reflects and supports broader learning objectives and offers opportunities for broader language input and learning.

As we begin to see the ways in which theories of language and learning may have influenced EFL in Finland, we now move towards an assessment of the contribution of traditions in language teaching.

2.2. Language Teaching

2.2.1. Approaches, methods, techniques

It is important to note here that perspectives on language teaching have been variously described as approaches, methods, techniques, theories, principles, trends, traditions, interpretations, habits, routines, choices, procedures, design, and so on. For our purposes here, some categorisation is necessary. Following Anthony (1963), *approach* refers to "a set of correlative assumptions dealing with the nature of language teaching and learning," a *method* is "an overall plan for the orderly presentation of language material… based upon the selected approach," while a *technique* "is a particular trick, stratagem, or contrivance used to accomplish an immediate objective" (63-67). We might also make a distinction between *method* as "the *how* of teaching" (Thornbury in Irie and Stewart 2011, 185) and *approach* as the "why" with which we are concerned. It is important to highlight this difference as it has bearing on the role of language choice in Finnish EFL classrooms—ultimately this choice may be justified on the basis of approach, method or technique.

2.2.2. A historical perspective

As Hall notes, "All histories of methods involve an element of compromise – when to start, and what timescale to cover?" (2016, 209). Long before the advent of the theories of learning mentioned above, increasingly structured and centralised education in the seventeenth century saw language learning consolidated into an intellectual pursuit, specifically for the study of Latin. For teaching purposes, Latin was codified and explained. As an intellectual practice, language learning became an act of conceptual understanding and memorisation.

The first distinct approach in this era has been termed the "Grammar-Translation Method," although,

> It is a method for which there is no theory. There is no literature that offers a rationale or justification for it or that attempts to relate it to issues in linguistics, psychology, or educational theory (Richards and Rodgers 2001, 7).

Despite this, the method took precedence until critique of its techniques reached momentum around 1940. Until then, expectations of accuracy in memorisation and intellectual understanding of deductively taught grammar were the norm. Reading and writing were used, with no significant role for speaking and listening. In addition,

> The student's native language is the medium of instruction. It is used to explain new items and to enable comparisons to be made between the foreign language and the student's native language (ibid., 6).

During this period, some dissenting voices were present. Interest in the language learning of children as well as a move towards emphasis on contextual meaning over bland memorisation took place in France (Marcel, 1793–1896), Great Britain (Prendergast, 1806–1886) and Germany (Gouin, 1831–1896). By starting to explore aspects of successful mother tongue acquisition, critics of the Grammar-Translation Method hoped to influence second language learning. These new ideas became known as the "Reform Movement".

Although the writing of history tends to polarise these approaches, in contrast to the Grammar-Translation Method, the Reform Movement emphasised spoken language, including conversation and pronunciation, and inductively taught grammar. A shift also took place in the way that the language of instruction was used, so that new meanings were taught "through establishing associations *within* the target language rather than by establishing associations with the native language (Richards and Rodgers 2001, 9, my emphasis). It seems the seeds of current trends in EFL classrooms were sown at this point as L1 grammar teaching gradually gave way to an emphasis on L2 and spoken language.

Work on the scientific analysis of language as well as on the study of psychology, led to the instigation of various theories of language teaching. In *Language Teaching Must Start Afresh* (1882), Wilhelm Viëtor highlighted the role of speech patterns in language learning, while Henry Sweet's *The Practical Study of Languages* (1899) emphasised the teacher's role in selecting, limiting and grading for difficulty the target language — for speaking and listening as well as for writing and reading. These theories were amalgamated into some Reformist general principles, including using oral-based methods to introduce sentences (not words) and

grammar in context. Significantly, grammar explanation and the reading of texts arbitrarily followed oral learning, and translation was avoided.

For some, this reformation of language teaching did not go far enough. Continued interest in first language acquisition led to the development of language teaching based on naturalistic principles of language learning. "The Direct Method," as it became known, encouraged predominantly oral classroom communication to be conducted in the target language, usually by native teachers with developed teaching skills who were able to demonstrate rather than translate. An emphasis on inductively taught grammar and everyday language aimed to produce target language ability through question-and-answer cycles and the association of ideas. The best-known proponents of this method were Sauveur (1826–1907) and Berlitz (1852–1921), both of whom enjoyed commercial success using these techniques in private language schools.

Although not without its critics, the Direct Method had a lasting impact on language teaching. As opposed to a historical analysis that places perhaps disparate ideas together into a hypothetical trend (such as the Grammar-Translation Method),

> The Direct Method can be regarded as the first language teaching method to have caught the attention of teachers and language teaching specialists, and it offered a methodology that appeared to move language teaching into a new era. It marked the beginning of the "methods era" (Richards and Rodgers 2001, 14).

"Methods" here refer to the use of consistent procedures with the particular intention of producing quality and effectiveness in learning. The idea that some teaching approaches may be more or less efficient was also strengthened by an interest in other effects of teaching, such as the concept of barriers to learning. Teaching thus became goal-oriented and it followed that different approaches justified their methods upon diverse assumptions about language learning and on the successful implementation of techniques.

These methods (or perhaps, methodologies) are too numerous to mention in full. As we shall see, those with significant influence on current teaching include the Natural Approach, the Audiolingual Method, the Communicative Approach and Content-/Task-Based teaching. For teachers today, however,

> approaches and methods can be studied not as prescriptions for how to teach but as a source of well-used practices, which teachers can adapt or implement based on their own needs. […] Experience in using different teaching approaches and methods can provide teachers with basic teaching skills that

> they can later add to or supplement as they develop teaching experience (Richards and Rodgers 2001, 16).

Current trends in language teaching have developed by appealing to those that have come before. Teachers may pick and choose between approaches and methods, although some may feel that methods should be adhered to faithfully—as is necessary of those developed strictly on the shoulders of language learning theory. The relationship between approach to teaching and classroom language use illustrates the ambiguity with which teachers follow such methods and how inconsistencies in method are a reality in modern classrooms.

2.2.3. Current trends in language teaching

In addition to the impact of historical tendencies, it has already been noted that learning theories such as Krashen's and approaches such as Terrell's have influenced the EFL classroom of today. Other approaches and methods also hold significance in current language teaching. A modest estimate of the most influential includes Grammar-Translation, the Direct Method, the Audiolingual Method, the 'Silent way', Desuggestopedia, Community Language Learning (Communicative Language Teaching), Total Physical Response, Communicative Language Teaching, Content-Based Instruction, Task-Based Language Teaching, and a Politically-Oriented Participatory Approach (Larsen-Freeman and Anderson 2011), some of which hold significance for current Finnish EFL classrooms.

The most influential of these has surely been Communicative Language Teaching. According to Hall (2016),

> Arguably still portrayed as the most significant development within ELT over the last 50 years, the emergence of CLT in the 1960s and 1970s is generally regarded as a clear paradigmatic break with the past.

The Communicative Approach, while emphasising target language use, has allowed language teaching to become more process-based and learner- and learning-centred, as well as sensitive to the social and diverse nature of classrooms. If we envisage that these language teaching methods are applicable to pedagogy in general, the overlap between the central tenets of the Communicative Approach and the more general objectives of the Finnish National Core Curriculum is striking. As summarised in Farrell (2010), the Communicative Approach aims to:

1. Encourage Learner Autonomy
2. Emphasize Social Nature of Learning
3. Develop Curricular Integration
4. Focus on Meaning
5. Celebrate Diversity
6. Expand Thinking Skills
7. Utilize Alternative Assessment Methods
8. Promote English Language Teachers as Co-learners.

As Kantelinen and Hildén point out, the curricula recognise "the need for language education that is wider in perspective than mere linguistic skills… emphasising individual's functional language proficiency in everyday situations and cultural encounters" (in Niemi et al. 2012, 159). It would seem that the rigours of the Communicative Approach would meet these objectives satisfactorily. This also adds justification to the inclusion into our picture of a goal-oriented classroom of the Content-Based Teaching (CBT) method, which "can be regarded as a logical development of some of the core principles of Communicative Language Teaching, particularly those that relate to the role of meaning in language learning" (Richards and Rodgers 2001, 151).

Closely related to Communicative and Content-Based approaches is Task-Based Teaching, which "seeks to reconcile methodology with current theories of second language acquisition" (ibid.). The aim of Task-Based methods is to support language learning through the use of meaningful real-life tasks with a focus on the process (not the product) of authentic and purposeful communication (see Willis 1996, Feez 1998). Task-Based Learning finds its focus in textbook-based teaching of culturally structured topics and, with the autonomy afforded to teachers in Finland, through teachers' own planning and authentic materials. As Long reminds us, "The classroom teacher is the expert on local needs and circumstances, so pedagogic procedures are the teacher's call" (2015, 327), allowing for motivational learning-focussed, student-goal-oriented tasks to be offered.

One other related and complimentary approach of current influence is the Audiolingual Method. The culmination of various approaches and techniques including the "Army Method," and variously applicable similar approaches such as the Oral Approach, the Aural-Oral Approach, and the Structural Approach, the Audiolingual Method promoted a structured approach that prioritised intensive, oral-based teaching and learning. The defining feature of

the Audiolingual Method is still visible in EFL classrooms today: that is, the practice of patterns. “It is these basic patterns that constitute the learner’s task. They require drill, drill, and more drill, and only enough vocabulary to make such drills possible” (Hockett 1959, in Richards and Rodgers 2001, 52). Alongside interactive and communicative tasks, repetitive (for example, vocabulary or grammar-related) tasks are still commonly practiced today.

As we see below, the cocktail of approaches found in the Finnish EFL classroom seem to promote target language use and limit L1 use. In reference to the trend of English-only EFL classrooms, Turnbull and Dailey-O'Cain worry that,

> It is perhaps unavoidable that many second and foreign-language educators and researchers have developed strong beliefs about the most effective way to master a language – beliefs that are not always grounded in theory or research (2009, 2).

These beliefs about effective language choice are influenced by school policies, language immersion program success, fears of language interference and other individual beliefs (or values) that teachers may hold, as well as the fact that L1 use

> connotes the dreaded grammar-translation methods that communicative language proponents loathe – after all, unless it is compensated by further target-language talk, codeswitching reduces exposure to that all-important comprehensible input in the target language (Turnbull and Dailey-O'Cain 2009, 2).

These factors create a dilemma for teachers that has not been adequately solved through language learning research. The current EFL classroom tends to focus instead on sociocultural and general learning (and curricula) objectives. As mentioned above, an emphasis on “how Vygotskian sociocultural theory frames teachers’ roles in second language learning (SLL)” leads Kim and Yoon (2012, xiv) to describe the EFL classroom thus:

> First, the teacher mediates and supports SLLs’ learning by using language as the main linguistic tool […] Second, the teacher promotes interaction by utilizing language as a social and political tool […] Third, the teacher assists SLLs to develop their learning through the meaningful activities of language and literacy in context. (2012, xix).

This provides an apt description of a language classroom in which the curriculum and learning goals and outcomes, as well as the approach to teaching including language choice and use, are both varied and multiple. As I show in my findings (chapter 4), in describing the current EFL classroom, the menagerie of influences and concerns highlighted in this chapter leads to a

conclusion that language teaching has entered a "post-methods era." This "cocktail," as I referred to it, relates to a teacher's fundamental position on theories of teaching and learning as well as the methods, techniques and tasks employed on a day-to-day basis. This leads to a situation in which "all classroom practices reflect teachers' principles and beliefs, and different belief systems among teachers can often explain why teachers conduct their classes in different ways" (Richards and Rodgers 2001, 251).

2.2.4. The Finnish EFL classroom

Although "Finland is still among the top countries in the world" (Välijärvi and Sulkunen in Niemi et al. 2012, 3), PISA results also show a "disconcerting deterioration" in gender equality and the effects of family background (ibid., 17). In attempting to reinstall Finland as "the leading country in modern education" (ibid. 18), cross-curricular use of digital technology and "systematic professional development for teachers" must be implemented in order to "develop a new pedagogical culture to support, on the one hand, collaborative learning and, on the other hand, individual learning" (ibid.). As we have seen,

> foreign language teaching is, not only in Finland but internationally as well, in the process of a paradigm shift towards foreign language education (focusing on education) that integrates experiential, sociocultural and ecological theories of learning (see e.g., Kohonen, 2009). Language education emphasizes meaningful learning that is based on personal experience, social interaction and reflection (Kantelinen and Hildén in Niemi et al. 2012, 159).

In the Finnish EFL classroom, we find the influence of historical teaching traditions as well as the impact of more recent international developments such as the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages and the European Language Portfolio, aiming at improving communication between Europeans from different language and cultural backgrounds and emphasising individual, lifelong language learning (Council of Europe, 2001, xi, 3–6), which were incorporated into the 2004 national curricula onwards.

The most recent curricula underscore the role of language in all learning and thinking and highlight the values of joy, playfulness and creativity at all levels (i.e. Finnish National Board of Education 2014, 28; 197). The curriculum for basic education is now organised through learning objectives in seven competence areas:

1. Thinking and learning to learn
2. Cultural competence, interaction and self-expression
3. Taking care of oneself and others, managing daily life
4. Multiliteracy
5. Competence in information and communication technology
6. Working life competence and entrepreneurship
7. Participation, involvement and building a sustainable future

Clearly, cultural competence (2) and multiliteracy (4) hold specific significance for EFL, but importantly it is the intention of the Finnish National Board of Education to integrate language teaching and learning into all seven competence areas.

In terms of approach and method for English teachers, these influences have produced a classroom in which

> there has been a shift from written to oral language, from grammar to language proficiency for real life needs, from translation to the communicative use of language, from teacher-centeredness to learner autonomy, from linguistic skills to intercultural communication competence and cultural sensitivity promoted by authentic intercultural encounters (e.g. Kohonen, Jaatinen, Kaikkonen, and Lehtovaara, 2001; EVK, 2003; Takala, 2009; Kohonen, 2009) (Kantelinen and Hildén in Niemi et al. 2012, 163).

Kantelinen and Hildén go on to describe a classroom in which "Communicative language teaching with modifications is the most common approach," although the "traditional form-focused study of grammar… seems to be reinforced by the written matriculation examination at the end of upper secondary school" (ibid.). They also note the focus on listening, understanding and speaking skills, with writing "introduced gradually and used to support oral practice" (ibid.) as well as the predominance of task-supported language teaching (a form of Task-Based Language Teaching). In practice, this creates a stereotypical EFL classroom in which language input from a text or video are linked to student's own experiences and the functional usefulness of language in real-life situations to motivate students to learn. Text comprehension, language understanding, and teacher and peer feedback all make up aspects of the oral tasks conducted in the classroom, while written tasks are more often conducted as homework (ibid.).

2.3. Language Policies in EFL classrooms

2.3.1. The role of language policies in theories of language and learning

Building on the historical narrative above, a concise summary of the role of L1 and L2 in approaches and methods is necessary. Richards and Rodgers (2001) chart the changing function of L1 from "translating sentences into and out of the target language" (2001, 6) in the Grammar-Translation Method, through the Reform Movement in which "the native language could be used in order to explain new words or check comprehension" (ibid., 11), to an emphasis on target language teaching by native-speaking teachers in the Direct Approach. As they remind us,

> all methods of language teaching involve the use of the target language. All methods thus involve overt or covert decisions concerning the selection of language items (words, sentence patterns, tenses, constructions, functions, topics, etc.) that are to be used within a course or method. Decisions about the choice of language content relate to both subject matter and linguistic matter. In straightforward terms, one makes decisions about what to talk about (subject matter) and how to talk about it (linguistic matter) (Richards and Rodgers 2001, 25).

Today, language use still plays a crucial role in the Communicative Language Teaching, Task-Based Language Teaching and form-focussed grammar teaching that we find in the Finnish EFL classroom. According to Macaro (2001, 2005), teacher language choice relies on a variety of ideas about the effects of language on learning. His "virtual position" describes a classroom in which L1 is completely absent as the teacher sees in it no pedagogical or communicative value. This position is founded upon hypotheses about the similarity of L1 and L2 acquisition (Krashen 1981, Ellis 1986), about language input (Krashen 1982), and its counterpart in Swain's comprehensible output hypothesis (1985). This "virtual position" is built on the shoulders of a long history of target language promotion going back at least to Carroll (1975), who "established a direct and positive correlation between learner achievement and teacher use of the target language" (quoted in Turnbull and Dailey-O'Cain 2009).

At the other end of the scale, in Macaro's "maximal position" teachers make unlimited use of L1 to teach L2. As we see below, this position is also justifiable – no research has shown a causal relationship between excluding L1 and improved learning (Macaro 2005, 66). Research like that of Levine (2003), shows the important role that L1 takes in L2 classroom learning, especially in terms of student motivation, and of the absence of any negative effect of L1 use.

In exploring how teachers make language use choices, we are really interested in two things: their initial position based on their values (beliefs, faith in a certain approach) and the reasons why they might diverge from this initial position. Macaro describes an "optimal position" in which L1 and L2 are both used in the classroom to positive effect and in which the negative effects of both are minimised.

In reality, what we are investigating here is the nature of – and justification for – this optimal position. The approaches discussed above influence teaching methods in the classroom as well as teachers' overall values, including their perspectives on L1 and L2 use. My study explores the ways in which these values and their realisation in the classroom contribute to describing how an optimal position might be interpreted in Finnish EFL classrooms.

2.3.2. Findings of previous studies on language policy

Research into language choice and use in EFL classrooms has a long, if unfocussed history. As we have seen, "the belief that English, as a new language, is best learnt in an English-only environment, through processes resembling in some ways first-language acquisition, is widespread and seductive" (Kerr 2016, 513). Appealing to Krashen, this view is simply justified by the claim that more target language input (teaching) means more target language output (learning).

Studies show that state-funded (public) education decision-makers broadly support this idea (e.g. Macaro 2000, Mouhanna 2009, Lee 2012). In their survey of 2785 English teachers in 111 countries, Hall and Cook found that 63 per cent of teachers thought that an English-only classroom was expected by their institution (2013, 20). Most teachers reported that this view was also mirrored by teacher-training curricula (2013, 21) and 61 per cent of teachers agreed that L1 should be excluded or limited in EFL classrooms (2013, 17). Despite this, Hall and Cook found that the use of L1 was "a part of many teachers' everyday classroom practice" (2012: 16). This was supported by Levine (2014) who found that classroom L1 use ranged from 0 to 90 per cent of total lesson time (2014, 335).

But why should it be that teachers make these language choices? In summarising the findings of several studies on the functions of L1 in EFL classrooms (Polio and Duff, 1994; Rolin-Ianziti and Varshney, 2008; Littlewood and Yu, 2011; and particularly Ellis, 1994; and Kim and Elder, 2005), Kerr (2016, 516) presents the following list:

'Medium-oriented' or 'core' functions (i.e. concerned with the teaching of language)

- Teaching, explaining and checking understanding of grammar, vocabulary and texts

'Framework' and 'social' functions (i.e. concerned with the management of the classroom)

- Managing personal relationships in the classroom (e.g. building rapport, maintaining discipline)
- Giving instructions for classroom and homework tasks
- Giving administrative information
- Lightening cognitive load
- Discussing methodological options

Hall and Cook (2014) discovered similar categories in so far as "a majority of participating teachers reported using the learners' own language to explain when meanings in English are unclear, and to explain vocabulary and grammar when they considered this necessary" (2014, 45), as well as using significantly more L1 "with lower-level English-language learners than higher-level students," although, they claim, "learner age, class size or own-language background" should not influence language choice (ibid.).

Here we find ample examples, if not justifications, of why teachers might make use of L1. Kerr (2016) reminds us of the reasons why many teachers still prohibit their own L1 use. Firstly, he notes that translation is not a necessary language-learning skill on a par with speaking, listening, reading and writing. Secondly, time spent using L1 is time lost from using L2. Thirdly, interference (see Lado 1964) from L1 affects the ability to think in L2 and may lead to a belief that languages have direct equivalence on a word-for-word level.

These issues are variously rebutted by other research. Cook (2008, 2010) argues that translation is not a rigid discipline and that translation serves many useful purposes in the EFL classroom. The opportunity cost of using L1 is balanced by the ability to "speed things up" (Macaro, 2005: 69) in the classroom through L1 use. In addition to a consensus on the compartmentalisation of L1 and L2 in learner brains and the objective of language learning being the production of multilinguals as opposed to native speakers (see Kerr 2016, 520), Macaro also points out that

the process of learning inevitably requires the use of L1 as the learner's language of thought (2005: 68). Finally, worries about the effect of interference have been replaced by the broader concept of language *transfer*, which is considered neither wholly negative, wholly one-directional nor wholly related to word-for-word translations. In fact, translation may encourage learning though an awareness of the differences between languages (see Ellis and Shintani, 2014; and Laufer and Girsai, 2008).

One final point here relates to the obvious difference between teachers' reported language choices and their actual L1 use in the classroom, as well as the disparity between teachers' intentions (values) and their classroom behaviour (e.g. Polio and Duff, 1994; Árva and Medgyes, 2000): teachers suffer conflict in the classroom, "feeling damned if they speak L1 and damned if they do not" (Copland and Neokleous 2011, 271), and feelings of guilt when they "resort" to L1 (Macaro, 2005).

We are left with a theoretically ambiguous position in which some researchers "have even suggested that the virtual position on target language use has reached hegemonic status" (Turnbull and Dailey-O'Cain 2009, 4), yet "to insist that no use be made of the L1 in carrying out tasks that are both linguistically and cognitively complex is to deny the use of an important cognitive tool" (Swain and Lapkin, 2000, 269). Proponents of English-only are quick to defend the benefits of target language use, while teachers and academics increasingly defend the choice of L1 in the classroom in order to promote learning. This thesis aims to discover the perspectives of Finnish EFL teachers on language choice to explore the role of L1 in Finnish EFL classrooms.

3. Data and Methodology

The importance of language choice in theories of language learning and approaches to language teaching (van Lier 1996 and Cook, 2001; Turnbull and Arnett, 2002) was explored in chapter 2. From a practical point of view, research has also described classroom language use using, for example, conversation analysis (Üstünel and Seedhouse, 2005). In order to discover the ways in which language learning and teaching is related to classroom language choice, I decided to obtain data directly from in-service teachers. Teachers' own perspectives offer a valuable resource in making connections between approaches to teaching, methods and practices in the EFL classroom and the possible benefits and effects of language choice and use. This chapter describes the methodology required to investigate this issue.

3.1. Study Design

In attempting to obtain the opinions of in-service teachers, the first choice in terms of data collection was whether to collect quantitative data from a large number of teachers (from a questionnaire or online survey, for example) or more in-depth qualitative data from fewer teachers. In order to delve more deeply – as opposed to broadly – into teachers' perspectives, I chose to collect as much qualitative data as I could from a smaller number of participants. Although surveys allow a greater number of participants, the flexibility of interviews allowed specific ideas to be explored more profoundly and the possibility for prompts and impromptu questions gave adaptability to the data collection.

In-service teachers, those with varying degrees of experience in the EFL classroom, are as much a source of teaching knowledge as they are a source of learning research and teaching reflection. During my own teacher training, I found the advice and guidance of mentor teachers invaluable – but more than that, I found it *influential* on my own teaching. Mentor teachers in teacher training schools are perhaps an even more valuable resource as they have an additional role in training and inspiring future teachers. Their methods and classroom language choices have presumably been honed and justified – also to others – in their roles as mentors. It also seems likely that, through their close connection with associated universities, teacher training schools will harbour an atmosphere of reflection and a drive towards professional development and improvement, even among those in-service teachers who do not act as teacher training mentors.

For these reasons, I collected data from a university-affiliated teacher training school. By interviewing the teachers directly, I hoped to obtain insightful perspectives into their language use and the justifications for their approaches and habits. I believed that teachers at a teacher training school would be better prepared to justify their teaching practices and language use as this would be a regular reflective practice in such an environment and would be required of their role as mentors to pre-service teachers. I also hoped that they would speak freely and honestly about their own methods without being influenced by a succession of leading questions. Thus, I decided on a semi-structured interview technique. Two pilot interviews were used to test this method in order to construct and refine an interview guide and to assess the suitability of its questions and prompts. The pilot interviewees were trainee teachers and were thus professionally and ethically suitable to test my study; they had the required knowledge of teaching English, but they were unaffiliated to any school or students.

After creating consent and data protection forms (see chapter 3.6 and Appendix 8.1) in order to address the ethical issues involved and obtaining permission from the principal of the school in question, I contacted the teachers by email to arrange meetings. The interviews were then conducted online through the use of Zoom video calls. The participants gave permission for these calls to be recorded, so the interview data was automatically saved for analysis. The average length of interview was 40 minutes.

3.2. Participants

I managed to obtain a sample of five participants, three of whom were full-time EFL mentor teachers with over 50 years of teaching experience between them. Two other participants were part-time teachers with less than two years' EFL teaching practice (one of these also had a limited mentoring role). The teachers had varying degrees of experience in teaching different languages, age groups and learner language levels. I did not see any relevance in analysing the data for aspects related to the participant's age and gender (as these do not factor specifically into the analysis), which also helps to protect participants' anonymity. Each of the five was currently (academic year 2020-2021) teaching lower secondary school (grades 7 to 9, four to eight years' experience) and three of the five also taught upper secondary school (learner age: 17-19, six to ten years' experience).

In answering the interview questions, I requested that the participants specifically provided perspectives on their current teaching in their lower and/or upper secondary school. I did not

set out to contrast length of teaching experience or differences between mentoring and non-mentoring teachers, but nonetheless this adds another aspect to my findings (chapter 4); interview data may reveal that participants answer questions and elaborate on topics based on a position. In this way, mentor teachers may have answered my questions *as* mentor teachers and new teachers may have answered my questions *as* new teachers. All teachers participated in accordance with a conception of their own professional image and teacher identity.

3.3. Interview questions

Building on my research questions, I attempted to raise the subject of classroom language choice, use and justification with very general and open investigation. I hoped that I could do this without leading the interviewees' responses. I used an interview guide (see Appendix 8.2) which began with generally describing the purpose and topic of the study and its related confidentiality issues, followed by some general questions to discover the participant's teaching background. The interviews continued with the following questions:

- In which situations do you use which languages in your classrooms?
- In what situations do you change to Finnish?
- How do you encourage students to use English?
- What influenced your use of those languages in the classroom?
- Why do you use English and Finnish the way that you do?

Participants frequently provided answers to questions before they were asked, so not all questions were posed to all participants. Although the participants responded very fully to my initial questions, probing questions were sometimes necessary to obtain more information on these subjects. In addition, I posed some related additional questions:

- How is your teacher persona or role connected to language choice?
- What do you think of translation exercises and tasks?
- How does classroom language choice relate to students with another mother tongue?
- How often do you reflect on your methods?
- What do you think is the most common language policy in Finnish EFL classrooms?

In some cases, it was also necessary to probe for specific language policy perspectives – for example, on the subjects of:

- grammar
- weaker students / younger learners / differentiation
- classroom management / student motivation
- the importance of students' full understanding (for text comprehension, grammar, etc.)

I then offered the participant the chance to ask questions from me and finally closed the interview with thanks.

3.4. Data analysis

Once I had the recorded data, I used the Microsoft Word dictate function to transcribe the interviews into text documents and I then evaluated and edited these documents for accuracy and to include transcription conventions from the University of Helsinki's ELFA corpus project, which provided detailed enough characteristics for the analysis of the interview data (see ELFA Transcription Guide 2004, see Appendix 8.3).

Following the work of Thornberg and Charmaz (in Flick (ed.) 2014) on the Grounded Theory and Theoretical Coding developed by Glaser and Strauss (see, for example, 1967), I aimed to process the interview transcripts to describe, compare, and explain the similarities, differences and patterns that I found in order to develop a theory (or theories) based on the content of the data.

As the data was made up of teachers' own perspectives, these subjective experiences may include unintended or unconscious aspects that may also make up part of a theory grounded in the perspectives. In this way, a constructivist approach to categorising the data was used, including the adoption of new conceptual categories and the subsequent systematic search for variation and justification. The data was initially coded (labelled) through a process of memo analysis and then a focussed codification was used to build and evaluate interpretations for reliability and validity. Borrowing tools from Qualitative Content Analysis (see Schreier in Flick (ed.) 2014), sections and utterances from the interviews were assigned to categories in a systematic but flexible coding framework of main categories and subcategories of different hierarchical levels.

Based on my research questions, the interview guide and the commonalities between topics and topical organisation in the data as a whole, the selected categories grew into the following themes (see chapter 4):

- *background factors*, such as their own language learning experiences, were frequently raised first (Research Question 2: How do they justify their language policies?);
- explaining their *classroom use of English (L2) and Finnish (L1)* frequently followed (Research Question 1: What language policies do teachers report using in Finnish EFL classrooms?);
- teachers often expanded on this by describing their *expectations for student language use* (Research Question 1: What language policies do teachers report using in Finnish EFL classrooms?);
- they next specifically explored reasons why codeswitching might take place (Research Question 3: In what ways, if any, do teachers report breaking these policies?).
- these diverse descriptions were finally *justified* in various ways (Research Question 2: How do they justify their language policies?).

3.5. Limitations

The theories and arguments that make up the findings in chapter 4 are my interpretations evidenced by the interview data. Also, the focused nature of the data – from a single school in a single town – necessarily limits the wider application of the constructed theories. Generalisations based on such a small sample of qualitative perspectives are understandably limited, although as an exploration of teachers' language policies in EFL in Finland, the findings arguably justify broader implications. Further testing of the arguments would clearly be necessary to extend the generalisations beyond this school at this time. Such studies may show local or regional variations as well as a number of differing approaches, influences and justifications.

That said, the suitability of these methods for a study of this kind is appropriate. Semi-structured interviews of a small number of participants yielded an appropriate amount of very detailed data and the focus on a single school allowed for an in-depth case study to be constructed, one that surely holds implications for other schools, other EFL classrooms and for

language teaching in general. Interpreting the data through the use of aspects of grounded theory and qualitative content analysis allowed reasonable and defensible arguments and theories to be developed which may hold limited implications for further and future research.

3.6. Ethical considerations

In collecting, analysing and reproducing interview data, it was necessary to make ethical considerations. As the informed consent form and GDPR Privacy Notice make clear (Appendix 8.1), these concerns were supported by adherence to University of Helsinki, Finnish, EU and academic community guidelines on consent, data management and participant anonymity. Participants were made aware of the research topic and the data that would be collected. Their anonymity was ensured through the protection of their identifiers, including voices. Participants were given the opportunity to question the research topic and design, but they were familiar with research processes and supported my work. After studying the permission and data protection forms, the participants emailed their consent to me directly. Email correspondence and data collected are treated confidentially.

Interview data is attributed to individual teachers using an anonymous numbered code. The first quotation used in this thesis is attributed to “T1”, the second quotation to “T2” and so on. These references hold no other significance beyond identifying evidence from five different sources.

4. Findings

In this chapter, I will draw together findings from the five teacher interviews. As described above, informed by grounded theory and qualitative content analysis, patterns of perspective and relationships between opinions were discovered. Both tendencies and variances are included in the findings. Quotations from the teachers are used to explain and support the themes identified in the data. In some cases, quotations from several teachers will be used interchangeably to support a perspective which represents the overarching view in this school at this time. In other cases, individual opinions will be contrasted with other teachers' views. The findings allow a case study to be explored in which teachers share or do not share perspectives to a larger or lesser extent. Thus, their viewpoints as a whole are at once diverse and corroborative. A discussion including interpretations and implications of these findings will follow in chapter 5.

Drawing on my research questions, this chapter will be organised thematically. As described in the data analysis chapter (3.4), the following themes resulted from preliminary coding in which thematic patterns were detected, and from the systematic review and honing of these patterns into four broad themes. The data shows that teachers often initially justify their language policies based on background factors such as their own language learning experiences. They then go on to specify what these policies are in terms of their own language use and that of their students. Finally, they justify their target language and L1 use and the reasons why codeswitching may take place.

Section 4.1 starts with a description of the relevant backgrounds of the teachers and the kinds of experiential influences that have shaped their languages policies. In section 4.2, I will go on to describe these policies in terms of the teachers' overall approach to language choice and use. In this section, the overlap between classroom language policies and pedagogical approaches to language learning and teaching will be explored. Section 4.3 will highlight teachers' expectations about their students' language choice, how they encourage or discourage language use and when they might make exceptions to these expectations. In section 4.4, the specifics of teachers' language choice and use in different classroom and school situations will be investigated. Occasions when teachers reported that codeswitching may take place will be systematically listed here. In the final section, 4.5, the teachers' justifications for their language

choice and use will be described. These justifications link teaching background and experience, pedagogical foundations as well as their own values and beliefs about learning and teaching.

4.1. Influence of teacher background

Firstly, I will report the influences that teachers alluded to in constructing their classroom language policies. These are included here at the start of the findings as they are related to the teachers' own backgrounds, rather than to specific theoretical perspectives, methods or values associated with the experience of teaching in the classroom. In this way, they may predate conscious efforts to evaluate and reflect on language choice. These are the foundations of their teaching values, preludes to their more mindful planning and teaching choices.

The teachers' perspectives are understandably affected by their type and length of service. Ranging from a few months to thirty years, including several teaching subjects (other languages and also non-language subjects) and experience of every level of language teaching from grade 1 to adult learners, in both Finnish language and English language educational settings, the teachers represented diverse backgrounds and influences.

To a large extent unprompted, every teacher wanted to describe the influence of their own language learning, their "personal experience" (T1: Teacher 1). Some of these perspectives appear to be values developed in childhood: "I've never been afraid of making mistakes […] I've always seen… beyond the language… favouring the human communication [and] getting the things done" (T2). Others referred specifically to their own language teaching in school. One participant had a teacher whose English was "a pleasure to listen [to, but] she never let us [say] anything" (T3). Another participant "always had teachers [who] refused to speak Finnish in school" (T4). The influence of language learning at school clearly affects a teachers' own approaches to teaching.

Experiences outside education also had a profound effect. After being a successful language learner at school, one participant had a "humiliating" real-life experience: "I found to my astonishment then and there that I'm not sure how to order a cup of coffee… clearly I had not been trained […] I thought hang on this can't be right" (T1). This profoundly affected this teachers' opinion on Communicative Language Teaching. Real world experiences influenced another teacher to favour an "immersion approach […] my thought having been in so many

different countries and being immersed all the time I'm just such a strong believer in that way of teaching" (T5).

Every participant mentioned their own teacher training as an influence, although they did not reference teacher training as a principal justification for their language policies. Teacher training "encouraged… freedom […] we're very autonomous as English teachers in Finland so we can always choose how we… work" (T3). Teachers were able to "pick and choose what [they] like from the teacher training" (T5), and it seemed clear that teaching education was only a single influence amongst many.

In-service teachers, colleagues and school culture also influenced the teachers. One remembered how "older colleagues [who] only taught in English everything in English… discussed [their] policy", leading to the development of this teacher's English-only language policy (although the need to "compare… how fast they advanced" (T3) was not incorporated). Current colleagues also influenced teachers. For professional development, one teacher had "been asking… so many people [colleagues] about this" (T4). Other teachers were missing the influence of colleagues. One remarked, "I don't know if this is typical […] are my thoughts very different from other English teachers", concluding "I think all teachers do probably find their own way" (T5). Another reported, "I get so… carried away with my own ideas I might forget that there are others [but] I trust my colleagues… everyone has something to give"; and for the benefit of the students, "it's great that it's not the same things" (T2).

In both other schools and other language subjects, teachers may have other policies. One teacher thought that "English teachers work this way they only speak English apart from [in] some schools" (T3). When hearing about the more Finnish-based language policies of teachers "in some other languages", one teacher had to admit "that's not how we work" (T3). Another teacher commented that a more English-based language policy is effective in "a better school" (T5), perhaps referring to a school in which students are more engaged in learning.

When teachers reflect on their own language use, they commented that "whenever you speak a foreign language you take on a role" (T1), in which "you just use English all the time" (T4): they "have some kind of an English persona when [they] walk into the classroom" (T5). Within this role, the teacher might "struggle with [English] words all the time" (T1) or, in fact, "struggle with finding the Finnish versions of things" (T4). Equally, this persona might be a "mixture of both" (T5) languages and self-reflection might reveal that "it's hard to say myself

am I consistent or not" (T5), which suggests that policy intentions may differ from classroom practice. One teacher highlighted the risk that teachers can "easily start [to] explain things in Finnish" (T3). Both of these comments also suggest that teachers may view codeswitching in a negative light.

Reflection on methods and language policies are important to successful teaching. Teachers commented on the need "to reconsider my ways of doing what I do […] you have to re-evaluate your own methods" (T2), and "I think it's really useful to reflect […] you should always think about these things" (T1). Mentor teachers, whose role includes influencing the language policies of teacher trainees, may have spoken about their language policies *as* mentor teachers. One commented from that position, "if I didn't have any student teachers […] I don't think I would think about it at all anymore" (T3). Another teacher reported, "I do think about these things quite a lot but I don't have to verbalise them very often I think it's a good exercise" (T1).

Several aspects of teachers' backgrounds seem to influence their approach to language teaching. Their own language learning experiences as well as experiences of using a foreign language in the real world have contributed to promoting an English-only policy. This policy has been supported by knowledge gained from teacher-training and though the influence of teaching colleagues and school cultures. The notion of an English persona was also significant for the teachers. Finally, reflecting on the classroom success of language policies justifies their continuation or adjustment. These background influences all suggest a commitment to classroom language policies promoting English use.

4.2. Overall approach to language choice and use

The teachers all agreed that it is necessary to use English to teach English. No one argued that English could be taught predominantly in Finnish – "unlike… of course in Math" (T2) and other non-language subjects which use L1 as a tool for teaching. The initial answer to my question "In which situations do you use which languages in your classrooms?" was consistently along the lines of "I would say that I only use English in my classes" (T3). For example, one teacher reported: "I start all the courses in English of course" including all "chatting", "attendance", "communication" and "instructions" (T2). Another claimed to speak "English in all situations especially communication" including "talk about the weather… we're going to do it in English" (T4). Another has the "idea in my head that I will be using English throughout", that English "always is still my sort of my default option" (T1), while another

replied they use “as much English as possible” (T5). Three teachers offered percentages of English spoken in the classroom: two agreeing on the figure of 99 per cent while one estimated 90-95 per cent in upper secondary school and 80 per cent in lower secondary school. The accuracy of these self-reported claims are naturally impossible to evaluate for this study. However, the claims themselves are noteworthy when contrasted with teachers’ descriptions of their language use.

The teachers seemed to defend the idea of using only English in terms of approach, while they went on to describe the (somewhat numerous) exceptions to this policy. It was mentioned several times that speaking is done in English, but teachers’ written material may sometimes be in Finnish, while textbooks and translations exercises (English to Finnish and Finnish to English) “have their place” (T1). One teacher explained, “I found that it's the best to have the slides sometimes in Finnish and explain in English” (T2). Another reported, the “rule may be in Finnish [but I] speak English” (T3). This raises the issue that, while teachers may employ a certain language policy, the languages used by students and in classroom materials is also influential on overall language policy.

Other exceptions, as we will see below, include the teaching of grammar, behaviour management and differentiation for students of varying language levels. From the point of view of language learning objectives, the teachers explained that contact with more English gained better learning results (“more input [means] more output as well” (T4)). One reported, “I think it's funny if you teach English in Finnish” (T3), while another pointed out that although English is “at the same time the tool and the objective of learning”, the students should “tolerate that they don't understand” (T2).

The situations and strategies undertaken when Finnish use took place ranged from teacher codeswitching inside and outside class time to a commitment to never breaching self-induced language protocols in any situation. In the classroom, teachers may “ask someone [to] explain [in] Finnish” (this teacher said, “I never… translate myself” (T2)). The strategy of asking a student to translate was reported by almost all teachers, although (with the exception of the teacher mentioned) teachers were also willing to translate their teaching when necessary. They claimed to speak English “unless the subject is somehow crucial”; for example, when talking about “exam info or grades”, this teacher would speak “in English first and then… I say the same thing in Finnish” (T4). In upper secondary school, the teachers said that all

communication was conducted in English, “apart from [talking about] the matriculation examination… then I speak Finnish” (T3).

As we will see below, several teachers mentioned that they might speak “Finnish individually” (T3) to students in the classroom when they felt it necessary; for instance, to “feel that people are understanding” (T5). However, in this Finnish language school, the teachers told that “after the class has finished… practical arrangement talk is normally done in Finnish” (T2). In “interactions outside classroom”, some teachers “use English there very often” (T1), while others require that the students “understand that they're gonna have to speak English to me in the hallway if I speak English to them” (T4).

Importantly, the teachers openly reported their values regarding teaching and learning. Although learning English is important, “inclusion… that's my number one priority” (T2). Another reported, “if I want the student to feel safe and not threatened by anything at all then I tend to switch to Finnish” (T1). Whereas the teachers describe and justify their language choices eloquently, it also seemed applicable that teachers “very seldom plan it beforehand to be honest” (T1).

On the subject of codeswitching itself, the teachers gave differing opinions. For one, “it's kind of annoying to be jumping back and forth between two languages all the time… I only do it when it's absolutely necessary” (T5), while for another it was easy to “quite fluently switch between languages” (T4). Some teachers shared the attitude that codeswitching is “natural because we're all Finnish speakers” (T1). Another saw the relationship between English and Finnish to be necessary, but not fixed: “we’re kind of preparing them to switch fully into English by the time they go to high school”; this teacher plans “to increase the use of English” (T4) as her students’ language skills improve.

As we explore below, in evaluating their language choices, the teachers also mentioned that students must “understand that it takes time [and] patience and I also want to prepare them for… the future” and that language learning can be “uncomfortable” (T2). Another teacher suggested that “if you have the will to learn a language I think [speaking only the target language] is the best way to go about it” (T5).

Finally in this section, although I consciously avoided terms such as “rule” and “policy” when interviewing the teachers, they themselves mentioned such words. On the subject of language

policy – described by a teacher as one of the "methods in teacher training" (T5) – one teacher spoke of trying "to avoid any sorts of rules", going on to say that their approach "works for me but it's not a general rule" (T1). Another spoke of having "some grounds for… my policy" (T3). As we have seen, even those teachers that did not openly label their teaching with terms such as "policy" nonetheless clearly described habits and thought-out practices.

From a starting point describing such a "rule" or "policy" to use "99 per cent" English, the teachers raised several factors that highlighted the difficulty and complexity of this approach. In describing their overall policies for language choice and use in the EFL classroom, the teachers in fact immediately and openly discussed the *exceptions* to their target language promoting policies. For reasons of materials, grammar-teaching, behaviour management, differentiation and student understanding, teachers might translate their intended target language use into L1 or otherwise select L1 over L2. Although teachers' judgement of codeswitching was negative, their own values sometimes required this L1 preference for situations in which teacher-student interaction took precedence over language learning. Finally, although flexibility for codeswitching was commonplace, the teachers also held a belief that student patience towards an English-only approach would yield effective results. This section has illustrated the contrasts and intricacies of language policy choice and use.

4.3. Teacher expectations of students

The language used by the teacher makes up only a single aspect of students' language learning. As we have seen, students' own language production is essential to language learning. The expectations the teachers have of their students' language production is fundamental to teachers' classroom language policies. The teachers used terms such as "encourage" (T3) and "strict" (T1) in talking about their expectations for student English use. They mentioned the need to give a "quick reminder" (T4) to the students to speak English – "I remind them all the time" (T4) – and how important it is to "encourage them" (T5).

It proved to be the case that expectations differed somewhat between teachers. Whereas one spoke of the students' "need to control" their language output, "we must encourage them into making an effort" (T2), others were tolerant of occasions when group work could "very easily turn into Finnish" (T3). With time, "quickly they learn into using English [and say] I'm sorry and then they switch it to English again" (T3).

One teacher in particular expressed concerns over the motivational aspect of demanding that the students speak in English. Although initially “adamant about using target language… I found that being as strict as that is maybe not so helpful” (T1). In this case, the teacher felt flexibility and tolerance were more conducive to language learning.

When students codeswitched or seemed to resist speaking English, the teachers had different views. On one hand, a teacher prioritised “participating” and would “rather they say something in any language than not to say anything at all” (T2), while another thought that the more you have pair work the better the atmosphere for learning and English production. One teacher talked of sometimes giving “permission to speak Finnish” (T4). Another went further, stating: “if I want the student to feel safe and not threatened by anything at all then I tend to switch [the conversation] to Finnish” (T1).

This was mirrored by another teacher who, when “they reply in Finnish”, might “encourage them into saying it in English” by saying “oh don't speak Finnish [or] that's a good start”, by asking “probing questions… please tell more and now if you like in English” or through the giving of “good feedback”; this teacher “wouldn't… rebuke them” (T2) for speaking Finnish. Interestingly, the teachers’ commitment to encouraging target language use also appeared in practice to be secondary to values such as participation and learning atmosphere.

Whereas the students may develop a “whole different… alter ego or… English class persona” (T4), outside the classroom, language use was more flexible: “if they approach me in English that's fine… I will reply [to] them in the same language” (T2), but also “I’ll answer their questions in Finnish [because] I don't want that like to hinder them approaching me […] I don't demand or request the same… language” (T2). The language dichotomy was made clear by one teacher: “I think it's OK 'cause I am a Finnish person to even address them outside the classroom in Finnish if they want to come and speak Finnish” (T5).

Again, this section illustrates the complexities of language policies. Although the teachers agreed that students must speak English for effective learning, they differed in their strictness to enforce this policy. The general position was to remind and encourage students to participate in the target language. The need for students to control their own learning was mentioned as was the possible risk to motivation if language policies are too strict. Tolerance to student codeswitching and the role of a possible student language persona was reported differently by

different teachers, although their comments point towards a flexibility regarding student L1 use that contrasts with their expectations.

4.4. Codeswitching

Although each teacher appealed to the approach that "[there is an] idea in my head that I will be using English throughout" (T1), it also quickly became clear that there were practical as well as language teaching and general pedagogic reasons why a teacher might speak Finnish. This codeswitching was more or less accepted by teachers who have differing teaching values and language policy commitments to expectations of students' understanding, differentiation and classroom management.

Whereas teachers argued that "it's alright if you don't understand yet… you will eventually" (T2) and "I don't think it's important they understand every single [thing]" (T1), every teacher agreed there was a moment when understanding a concept was more important than using English. Although "they have to start working from day one with me to understand" (T5), if the teacher sees "blank faces… then I might say the same thing in Finnish […] first in English… then say it again in… Finnish" (T1), so that the teacher can "help them out in Finnish… [and] they get the feeling of getting at least something out of it" (T4). Another teacher put it this way: "I think it's very important that they… do understand… [I will] refer to Finnish if I feel that now it's gone over the top of their heads" (T5).

The justifications and willingness to codeswitch varied between teachers. Understanding in classroom situations was not essential for all, but in certain ("crucial" (T4)) situations, Finnish should be used. For example, "instructions I might repeat those in Finnish [if] they tell me that they don't understand" (T4). The teachers used other strategies as well: "I still stick to saying the instructions in English and then I ask […] could someone explain" (T2). This avoided situations in which using Finnish would "make them lazy" (T2). Another teacher used the same strategy: "ask your mate" (T1). On the other hand, for reasons of "expedience", Finnish is "a convenient effective way of getting something across [if] I don't have time… so everybody I think gets it and then we can just move on" (T1). As we see below, the short-term and long-term values that influence these classroom decisions are varied and complicated.

Codeswitching also took place for reasons of differentiation. This related to students of different age and language levels, differing learning styles, as well as students with other

mother tongues and those requiring individual learning support. Every teacher spoke of the need to “take into account their individual needs”, to make “compromises [for] differentiation” (T2).

Differentiating for age was commonplace. According to one, “there's a difference in upper and lower secondary school” (T1) in the amount of codeswitching that took place. For “7th graders I use more Finnish” (T4), said another, while being “more strict about it as they grow older” (T1) was commonplace. It was agreed that the teachers were “preparing them to switch fully into English by the time they go to high school” (T4). One teacher mentioned that age level also required the additional need to differentiate according to national curriculum guidelines: “the younger they are the more I focus on the work… safe learning environment […] part of the learning process is that we learn how to live together” (T2) and codeswitching thus took place for these reasons.

Correspondingly, the students’ “skill levels” (T4) were also taken into account: “I've allowed the ones who have trouble to answer in Finnish” (T5). Finnish might also be used for “a 7th grade student [who] has never studied grammar in English it's going to be kind of hard to make the transition” (T4). However, “once they've learned it then I switch back to English” (T5). Codeswitching also takes place to differentiate for students with “different types of like learner personalities” (T2) including those that “want to have the rule” (T2) and “learners who want to be analytical” (T3) as well as “some students [who] don't benefit from rules at all” (T3). Finnish might also be used to help “students that are a bit more passive they're not going to raise their hand” (T4). Several teachers also mentioned that for “weaker” students, they might “explain it again in Finnish… after […] face to face or individually” (T1).

This might be necessary for “people from different backgrounds” (T2), for example. There are “more students with another mother tongue than Finnish than what people usually think… I don't really know what their mother tongues are” (T3). However, “when you speak only English you don't really have to think about it too much” (T3). On the other hand, “if you live in Finland you should learn the language that is spoken in Finland” (T1): “Finnish understanding is needed [so] in those classrooms [containing students with other mother tongues] you just have to speak a lot of Finnish” (T5). It is also the case that “it changes how I plan the lesson” (T2). Teachers might “cut some slack” (T5), they “might differentiate the test a little bit for them” (T1) or “avoid exercises that include translation sentences” (T2): rather they would “match the synonyms or the opposites [to] meet everyone's needs at the same time”

(T2). These strategies for differentiation to students with other mother tongues clearly appeal to different priorities for EFL-specific and general learning objectives.

As well as the national curriculum's goal to "foster a welcoming feeling towards… all the languages" (T2), it was also pointed out that students with other mother tongues "tend to like going to English classes" (T1) because they are in the "same position" (T3) as Finnish-speaking students. It is a "relief [because] in English class they can all be what they are" (T3). In this way, through differentiation, everyone can "benefit from what we're doing [from] different types of activities" (T3).

The only occasion when extra support was mentioned, it was in justifying speaking only English to students with other mother tongues: "many special education teachers have said that they… can be in the English classroom… OK but they need more help [in] other subjects" (T3). Regarding differentiation, it is interesting to note that this teacher reported: "I don't usually have any special education teachers in my classroom… I don't think it's only a good thing" (T3). Differentiation, whether through the use of Finnish or other methods, seems to be planned and conducted by the English teachers themselves.

As an example of "vital" (T1) content, several teachers mentioned using Finnish specifically when teaching grammar, whether or not the teachers agreed "when I did my teacher training… we were advised to use Finnish for teaching grammar and English to teach everything else" (T3). This still led to some teachers claiming to use only English with the "exception of grammar […] everything else to me seems very natural to do in English but grammar was the one thing" (T4), as students can "benefit from hearing especially grammar related things in Finnish… they make connections… that's how they build grammar in their minds" (T4). Another teacher suggested, "I've noticed that the ones that are not asking so many questions… having the slides in Finnish… favours them" (T2). Finally, the need to connect English learning to language learning in general was highlighted: it is beneficial to have "one common… grammar terminology bank in Finnish" (T4) in order to optimize the learning of several languages. On the other hand, one teacher expressed the following perspective: "I don't think grammar should be taught in Finnish… I don't think it's helpful I don't think there's a section… in a lesson that should always be in Finnish I think everything should be in English […] I don't think it's important they understand every single thing in class" (T1).

To an extent, teachers have limited choice in whether or not to use Finnish so long as their designated textbooks use Finnish language instructions and translation exercises. As we have seen, the teachers describe the use of translation as differentiation (for students of differing age and language level). This also applies to the role of Finnish in textbooks: "students who are the weakest… benefit the most from the textbooks" (T2). Opinions on using translation exercises for learning differed between teachers, although no teacher prohibited their use. Although considered "useful exercises" to use "occasionally [or] as homework", some teachers attempted to "discuss the questions in English even", claiming that a written translation exercise "doesn't require the teacher speaking any Finnish" (T3).

For some, translation exercises are a "good tool" (T5) to use "every now and then" (T2). They "have their place" (T1) "intertwined [in a] variety of methods" (T2). Although perhaps teachers were "taught at university… that translation is bad […] I'm exaggerating but that's what I learned when I started teaching" (T1), their general feeling now was that they "don't demonize translation exercises [or] shun them" (T2). In fact, as long as students "translate the idea" (T1) and "do not translate word for word" (T5), they may even help in "enforcing… the link between the two languages" and allow students of many languages to "make connections to Finnish to Swedish to French to Latin" (T4).

The teachers also described translation as "its own field of work" (T4). Students should sometimes think about "what kind of challenges would a translator [face]" (T2) and "practice translation" (T4) because "it's a skill [and] not all of them can do it" (T5). One teacher reported that, with practice, "you start thinking in English […] without translating" (T4). Others highlighted the role of translation as an "effective efficient way of testing" (T1), although with the caveat "don't enforce word for word translations in exams" (T4). Finally, translation tasks and exercises were seen to have a role in motivating students. In using only English, "if you have teenagers that are just totally uninterested and not willing to even try then you run into problems at least in the beginning" (T5).

Motivation for learning is also linked to students' behaviour in the classroom. The teachers observed that codeswitching has a role to play here, too. Some teachers decided that "classroom management I try to keep in English all the time" (T1), and "I try to be strict in English or friendly in English I try to do everything in English" (T5), but that "the more authoritative language is probably Finnish" (T4), which gets their "full attention" (T2). At certain times, for example when students are "restless" (T5), or at "the moment when I need them to behave [or

when] it's getting loud [or in order to] transition into another task" (T2) "[it] stops them in their tracks if I suddenly say something in Finnish" (T4). One teacher reported that students "won't talk so much if they have to use English […] I'll immediately say English [to them and they] all shut up immediately" (T5). The reasons given include clarity, "nothing… ambiguous" (T2), as well as to "use Finnish to wrap it up quickly… to eliminate the chance of further [interruptions]" (T4). Importantly, once behaviour returns to expectations, the teachers again would "then start the instruction in English" (T2).

In addition to learning motivation (including tackling restlessness), another aspect of classroom management is the willingness for students to communicate. Codeswitching seems to take place in situations in which honest and open communication is deemed necessary. Teachers mentioned that often students feel "I'm not gonna talk about that because I don't know how to say that in English" (T1), which would prevent them from talking about, for example, "bullying [or feeling] excluded" (T2). Specifically, because students are "anxious about producing the target language for fear of making these mistakes", teachers sometimes "switch back to Finnish" (T1).

Codeswitching in this sense seems to place personal, social and other transversal objectives (from teachers' own values as well as from planned curricula) ahead of language learning objectives. In their roles as language teachers – "someone who corrects their mistakes" (T1) – teachers may move away from their holistic role. Speaking and permitting Finnish allows students to "feel that they can talk about anything they want [if] they feel that they are being bullied or… they're anxious about corona" (T1), for instance. Some teachers' language policies clearly prioritise well-being over EFL objectives.

In commenting specifically on codeswitching, the teachers gave many examples of why their language policy to promote English would be broken. At the risk of creating "lazy" learners, L1 use promoted student understanding and made teaching more efficient – particularly for grammar teaching or for information regarding assessment. L1 also allowed more effective teaching as a tool to differentiate for slower learners or those with another mother tongue (although teachers disagreed on whether Finnish was suitable for this purpose). Textbook language use and the prevalence of translation as a language-learning method also encouraged L1 classroom choice. Finally, codeswitching took place for reasons of classroom management and motivation and to encourage valuable teacher-student interaction.

4.5. Justifications for language choice and use

For what reasons do teachers make their language choices in the classroom? How do they justify their use of English or Finnish and why would they codeswitch? In addition to influences from their backgrounds, the teachers also consciously justified their classroom language choices in terms of approach.

One teacher stated the importance of the English-only approach thus: “I would go as far as to say that if there are any truths I think this is one… I don't see any… reasons why there should be Finnish in the classroom” (T3). Nevertheless, this teacher also reported codeswitching as necessary in certain situations. The influence of the teachers’ background – of their “gut feeling” (T5) or on reflection based on “observation” (T3) – results in justifications focusing on the effectiveness of both language learning and other curriculum and pedagogic objectives.

The teachers spoke of a “moment of realization” (T2) that results from the “time and effort” (T1) that students must expend. Even though “a person has to start really working towards understanding a language… gradually [English can] start going into their heads” (T5). In this way, students may enjoy the results and even the process; whereas the teachers’ use of Finnish tends to “make them lazy” (T2), students may find that it is “a pleasure to… make an effort” (T2), which allows them to “reap the benefits later” (T1). According to the teachers, “so far there's never been a problem… that time hasn't… solved” (T1).

The students have a right to be taught in the most effective and productive way. One teacher put it: “they deserve to have English in the English classroom” (T3). Because students “don't get that many chances outside of the classroom to actually speak English” (T4), teachers must offer them “opportunities [to] use the language” (T4). Using the target language means that the students communicate, which results in more efficient and stress-free learning: “I think the more I use English the more comfortable the students are to use it as well so they don't just think it's a school subject but it's also a language of communication” (T4).

When students practice in this way, the “more you use and… you hear [the more] you understand” (T3), because this kind of learning is of “cumulative language that builds on itself” (T4). When “the kids just immerse into the English-speaking world [in the classroom] they catch it up so quickly”, this is “the best way to do it actually” (T3). Importantly, more than

other approaches towards language choice and use, this teacher has “come to think that this works” (T3).

Emphasising Communicative Language Teaching and Learning has some other effects. Although, “one of… if not the biggest problem in schools [is the emphasis on] accuracy” (T1), when students are in an English-only environment, they are “more inclined to try even if they fail” (T4). Although non-native teachers may “struggle with words all the time”, this encourages a safe environment for student risk-taking: “I'm not a native speaker but it's important that I model [the language] to them […] in a way that is… easy for them to relate to” (T1). This teacher also pointed out that “English is not neat and tidy by any stretch of the imagination [it is] a mess… that's what makes it beautiful” (T1). The teachers took a role in setting a good example by speaking (even struggling) in English in all situations, attempting to encourage an atmosphere of risk-taking among the students and also leading them to develop better pronunciation.

There are other teaching and learning benefits related to speaking English: “when you explain things in English then you also […] think about the listeners more than when you do it in Finnish” (T3). In addition, speaking Finnish has several negative effects: “it causes more than just a lack of time of English… [it] destroys the atmosphere” (T3) of willingness for communication and risk-taking in English. This teacher also found it “strange that the teacher starts jumping between English and Finnish” (T3), arguing that speaking only English in the classroom was “more natural… even if we're not native” speakers. Speaking Finnish, on the other hand, would be “weird [and] unnatural” in this situation and the students would be “disoriented” (T3).

As mentioned above, some teachers also expressed the opposite view that speaking English “creates a barrier” (T1) at times when the students’ well-being is the prime objective. It is important to reiterate here that some teachers will disregard these justifications and values for good reason; for example, if the teacher is in a “in a hurry [to] preserve time” (T4) or the student is “anxious about… things” (T1). An English-only policy is justifiable for these teachers so long as no one is “excluded due to language” (T2). However, these concerns are balanced by the linguistic and pedagogic benefits that English language choice “teaches them to cope in… situations where they don't understand” (T2), and it may also be true that English supports shy students because the “foreign language… liberates them” (T1).

Finally in this section, teachers have described a range of justifications for their language choices founded on influences from their backgrounds and various teaching and learning values, but their day-to-day reflection based on feedback from students and parents appears to be significant in shaping their language use. One teacher reported "listen to your students and find things that work for them… that's the only rule there is… I don't think anything is set in stone" (T1). Such student feedback might take the following forms: "I'm so sorry but… I was taught English in Finnish" (T3), "mutiny […] why can't we do it in Finnish" (T5), "I don't understand a word you're saying" (T3), or it might be more positive, "personal and emotional" (T2) feedback: "thanks for not giving up and thanks for sticking to your method despite… the conflict" (T2). One teacher admitted "I might not know how it's affecting a student's learning [but] they've mostly been satisfied", concluding "I might just increase English" (T4).

Teachers also mentioned that parents may suggest "maybe I could speak a bit of Finnish" (T3). In this case, parents would be encouraged to be "patient […] they will catch it up very easily" (T3). Teachers must reflect and make "decisions based on the individual in question" (T1). This means "before I start with a new class or new group […] I have to think how I will present it and in which language", but "being very aware of everything all the time that's tiring" (T2). Sometimes effective teaching means "go with the flow and enjoy" (T2).

In conclusion, teachers justify their language policies in several ways. For some, promoting an English-only classroom is the only teaching "truth" that exists. Through students' effort and patience, and through teachers' roles in promoting and modelling L2 communication which immerses students in an English environment, this policy of target language use yields effective language learning. L1 use in the EFL classroom not only wastes valuable target language use time but can also reduce or "destroy" the benefits gained through promoting English. However, L2 language choice should not be allowed to exclude any student – this is a possible cost that is not worth risking. Feedback from students and parents has generally supported teachers' language policies.

5. Discussion

The findings chapter above (chapter 4) outlines language policies, justifications and exceptions reported by EFL teachers in Finnish classrooms. The data reveals tendencies so that it is possible to discuss the findings as representational of EFL classrooms in this school at this time. The data also revealed variation between teachers, which points towards the complexity of this issue and the differing influences at work. Analysing the data is not a simple case of describing a classroom in which English-only is promoted. Nor is it possible to argue that L1 has the same influence in all of these classrooms at this time. The interview data illustrates deviations as well as subtle nuances to teachers' reported language policies which indicate not only Finnish teacher autonomy but also the complex of influences that make classroom language policies multifaceted.

Structured by my research questions, this discussion chapter will nevertheless begin by describing these reported language policies (5.1), going on to explore the justifications for these policies (5.2) and the reasons for which teachers reported breaking these policies (5.3). The discussion will attempt to link the data to theories of learning and traditions of teaching, as well as to previous studies on classroom language choice and use. Some final conclusions (chapter 6) will draw together the implications of this study.

5.1. What language policies do teachers report using in Finnish EFL classrooms?

Teachers make language choices based on long- and middle-term values as well as short-term necessities and whims. When asked to report their language policies, the teachers in this case study were able to describe and justify their policies firstly though such longer-term values and then through the practicalities of EFL classroom teaching. Features of learning theories and approaches to teaching were visible in the shadows of these descriptions, but the teachers did not strictly appeal to any prescribed theory, tradition, approach, method or technique. As Richards and Rodgers suggest, teachers and researchers may be reluctant to stipulate a definitive policy (or set or policies) because "they know that current knowledge is tentative, partial, and changing" (2001, 249).

As we have seen, teachers claim to use “99 per cent” English. Árva and Medgyes (2000) note that observations and reported intentions may not coincide. After an initial claim of a language policy approximating an English-only position, the teachers went on to describe numerous reasons for breaking this policy. Thus, it is necessary to consider here language *policies* rather than policy.

The combination of influences from various directions leads to a juxtaposition of teaching values on the one hand and classroom practicalities on the other. They claimed, for example, that teachers “must encourage [students] into making an effort” (T2) in order to cope and learn from an English-only approach. At the same time, teachers reported the “priority [of] trust and feeling of safety [and] inclusion in the classroom” (T2) which would require the use of L1.

Although the starting position of all teachers was for target language use, and despite abundant justifications for L1 use, teachers had differing views on the experience of codeswitching. Some would “quite fluently switch between languages” (T4) which is “natural because we're all Finnish speakers” (T1), but others found “it's kind of annoying to be jumping back and forth between two languages all the time… I only do it when it's absolutely necessary” (T5).

These differing perspectives also reflect the expectations for student language production. Emphasising target language communication requires student effort – which is an invaluable language learning objective (see both the Finnish National Core Curriculum 2014 and Council of Europe 2001). However, teachers would openly condone student L1 use in order to encourage interaction, especially on topics relating to student well-being. In this way, teachers’ overall language policies are distinct for the teachers themselves and for students. Strategic decisions are made from moment to moment in the classroom to assess the complex balance of objectives in order to select the appropriate language choice for both teacher and student. These strategies, such as asking fellow student to translate difficult to understand content, vary from teacher to teacher in promoting an English-only classroom. Similarly, strategies that make use of L1, for example to differentiate for slower learners, are variously employed. Such multifaceted reports of classroom decision-making – and subsequent strategies for the promotion of language policies – would require a large-scale, systematic study to create a framework for classroom language use. Classroom observations of EFL teachers’ decision-making (cf. Üstünel and Seedhouse, 2005) would add a further, empirical perspective.

Descriptions of language policies reported by the teachers in this study were in fact inseparable from their justification for the policies. The question of *what* language policies was swiftly followed by the *why*, and further followed by the *why not*. Teachers' approaches were closely tied to, and founded upon, their influences. It is to these matters that we now turn.

5.2. How do they justify their language policies?

When teachers justify their language policies, they justify three different aspects: their preference for target language use (and expectation of student target language use), their reasons for planned L1 use and their rationalisation for codeswitching from planned target language use.

The teachers in this case study justified their target language use and the promotion of an English-only classroom through appeals to their own backgrounds (including their own language learning) and their teaching experiences. As we have seen, target language use encourages student effort and requires an extended process of work, patience, tolerance, etc. An English-only classroom is an effective, immersive experience that allows efficient and *communicative* language learning – this was the main goal mentioned by the teachers. Enforcing student target language use regardless of mistakes aims to show that communication, not accuracy, is the primary classroom objective. Teachers' own language use should also reflect this objective. The similarities to the Communicative Language Teaching approach described in chapter 2 are clearly a justification for target language promotion in EFL classrooms, although the participants in this study did not at any point specifically mention an approach to teaching or theory of learning as a justification for language policies.

The English-only classroom offers students a rare opportunity to hear and speak, which teachers' report is necessary in order to learn. There is a need for English modelling (including pronunciation) and the opportunity to hear the example set by the teacher. Teachers also felt that spoken repetition is necessary, which makes an appeal to the drilling associated with the Audiolingual Method. In general, the justification for English-only seemed to be influenced by Krashen's input hypothesis (e.g. 1985) simplified by the teachers as: more input means more output. This being the case, the use of L1 presents an unfortunate waste of time, but, moreover, it "destroys the atmosphere" (T3) and can cause disorientation which disrupts learning effectiveness.

Although the participants' principal justifications for classroom target language use were experiential, based on "gut feeling" (T5) and values gained and developed outside and before teaching practice, knowledge of and contact with teaching traditions has surely had some influence on classroom language policies – if we attempt to make these connections. Had I directly asked about the influence of theories or historical traditions, perhaps the teachers would have justified their language policies with specific reference to their favoured approach to teaching or concept of language learning. However, as Penneycook points out, "first, there is little agreement as to which methods existed when, and in what order; second, there is little agreement and conceptual coherence to the terms used; and third, there is little evidence that methods ever reflected classroom reality" (1989: 602). Thus the cocktail of influences reported in this particular classroom reality appeal to various notions from various sources to create a combination of language policy justifications – which also justifies the relevance of seeking teacher perspective.

Whether through personal background, school culture or adherence to binding curricula objectives ("English is used as much as possible" FNCC 2014, e.g., 14.4.3), target language strategies only made up a part of the teachers' language policies. They also felt justified in their use of L1 and in necessary English to Finnish codeswitching, explored below (5.1.3).

5.3. In what ways, if any, do teachers report breaking these policies?

The significant finding of this study is that teachers claim to endorse an English-only language policy, but for diverse reasons do not uphold this policy. To varying degrees, all teachers interviewed decried the benefits of a target language policy, and to varying degrees all teachers interviewed readily justified breaking from this policy. Strict adherence to some traditions of teaching (for example, the total immersion approach, or theories positioning second language learning as comparable to first language learning) would certainly not allow codeswitching. However, as the data suggests, multiple influences can be established for EFL classroom language policies.

As the participants reported an English-only starting point, any use of L1 in the classroom amounts to codeswitching. This codeswitching took place for the following reasons: to ensure student understanding, to teach grammar, for translation tasks and exercises, for differentiation, for classroom management and to meet other curricula objectives. Comparing to the list of L1 practices summarised by Kerr (see 2.3.2), it is clear that the Finnish ELF classrooms in this

study exhibit many of the same justifications for L1 use. Previous studies highlighted the need for checking understanding, including grammar and comprehension, as a "core function" (Kerr 2016, 516) as well as the "social functions" (ibid.) of managing relationships and differentiation. Macaro's further justification that L1 can "speed things up" (2005: 69) was also mentioned by the teachers in this study and Levine's conclusion that L1 is the "unmarked language of communication in many arguably crucial moments of communication in the classroom" (2014: 6) is also supported by my findings.

In emphasising the need for student understanding, the teachers appeal to curriculum values such as inclusion – which is motivating for learning. Exclusion, on the other hand, is both demotivating and ethically inappropriate. The contrast here is striking. Teachers genuinely wish to promote inclusion and motivation to learn in an ethical, caring and empathic classroom environment, but they also reported that language objectives must be met by the "uncomfortable" (T2) realities of language learning. As Kantelinen and Hildén highlight, the curriculum "intertwines linguistic skills with a larger framework of multilingualism and multiliteracy, emphasising individual's functional language proficiency in everyday situations and cultural encounters" (2012, 159). Thus, both teaching values and learning objectives, for both general curriculum and language learning, contribute to the complicated real-time decision-making that teachers must undertake to provide "language education that is wider in perspective than mere linguistic skills" (ibid.). Kerr refers to this tendency towards the "utilitarian purpose" of language learning. As this case study has shown, "when these other objectives are brought more to the fore, the more there are reasons for not adopting an English-only policy" (Kerr 2016, 519). This also applied to the objective and necessity of classroom management, which many teachers felt was more effective in L1.

However, L1 is often chosen when language learning is the priority. The teachers reported the common belief that grammar teaching requires own-language explanation. This notion formed in teacher training, through the influence of colleagues and perhaps through a sensitivity towards the traditions of the Grammar-Translation Method that endures in teacher training curricula and language textbooks today still. Interestingly, it seemed that reading L1 materials in order to teach grammar was not considered a break of English-only policy as such but was rather a necessary tool for differentiation – for younger or slower learners, for different learner personalities, or for those that required "connections" (T4) to L1 and other languages.

The use of L1 for differentiation, both for groups of learners and individuals, was commonplace. The appeal here was to the role of L1 in guiding and accelerating student understanding. The relative effectiveness of community language (L1) use for students with a different mother tongue did not seem to be fully considered, although the need for all teachers to support community language learning and for these students to have "a common… grammar terminology bank in Finnish" (T4), as in the Grammar-Translation Method, may also justify L1 use for these students.

Routine L1 use in textbook exercises and tasks as well as in assessment make the avoidance of L1 in the classroom impossible. Translation exercises and student expectation of clear L1 instructions (to relieve the feeling of high stakes misunderstanding) create a necessity for codeswitching. The communicative English-only classroom often gives way to a multi-/pluri-lingual environment when textbooks are opened or tests are undertaken. Translation tasks were considered an effective tool for differentiation and efficient language learning, but this raises the dichotomy of current language teaching: target language is used for Communicative Language and Task-Based practice, but L1 seems necessary for language teaching. While textbooks and testing generally emphasise traditional Grammar-Translation methods over Communicative methods, codeswitching may always be necessary.

However, the teachers also raised the issue that a variety of teaching methods and strategies are appropriate in diverse EFL classrooms, for differentiation and motivation. Although they clearly reported attempting to create an English-only classroom, the reasons participants offered for codeswitching in fact developed into justifications for classroom L1 use.

6. Conclusions

We are left with the question, is an English-only classroom even possible? It seems that the requirements of curricula (including general and ethical objectives), the traditions of language teaching and the role of L1 in textbooks and testing make a strictly English-only Finnish EFL classroom unattainable. To meet language and general objectives, to motivate and differentiate, and to make use of varied methods and materials, teachers make strategic decisions to incorporate L1 into their language policies or they resort to previously unplanned codeswitching when they perceive a need. Their English-only expectation for student language use is also predisposed to flexibility towards contextual codeswitching and strategic L1 choice.

On the whole, though, their backgrounds, values and beliefs in effective language teaching approaches influence them to avoid codeswitching and promote English-only. These influences are juxtaposed against classroom and curricula realities to create classroom language policies and justifications that are diverse and changeable. Building upon previous research, the teacher interviews in this study described language policies that may be observable in EFL classrooms. The perspectives that the data offered on the perceived reasoning behind these policies, however, has allowed previously unexplored phenomena to be investigated. In this way, the interview data produced broad and detailed testimony to allow tendencies and variation of teacher perspectives to be analysed.

The subtleties of the interview data collected revealed that the issue is far more complex than English-only versus the Grammar-Translation Method. Macaro's "optimal use position" (2000, 181) is at once far more accurate and far too inexplicit to illustrate the complexities and nuances of classroom language choice and use. Tendencies in the data suggested all teachers are cognisant of the contrast between approaches to teaching and classroom practicalities. By collecting teacher perspectives, this thesis has offered multifaceted justifications for language policies as opposed to an explanation of observable practice. These justifications revealed tendencies, subtleties and variations of teacher perspective that classroom observation and interactional studies may not have been able to yield.

We may well ask why a binary view of classroom language policy has previously dominated language teaching approaches. This case study rather reveals a spectrum of language policies. Macaro's conclusion to discovering teacher preference for "optimal" language policies is to suggest that a structure for classroom L1 use could be developed. It would "provide, especially

for less experienced teachers, a framework that identifies when reference to the L1 can be a valuable tool and when it is simply used as an easy option" (2010, 545). The data described in this case study has begun to develop such a framework in outlining language policies from the teachers' perspective. Classroom observations and further teacher justifications would allow a clearer picture to be established. Although the methods and sample size in this thesis are limiting, the trends discovered indicate that this topic is worthy of further (and richer) study.

If we accept that L1 has a role in EFL classrooms, the attention must then switch to considerations of how (and how much) it can be employed appropriately. Kerr suggests a growing momentum behind a shift "away from own-language use as a 'crutch'… towards more principled practices" (2016, 523). As language policies including L1 use are promoted in literature and teacher training curricula, the move towards "'English-mainly', as opposed to 'English-only'" (ibid.) is likely to take place.

The relative autonomy allowed to Finnish teachers is clearly visible in this study. Background influences can impact on teaching approaches and methods. If language policies "cannot be predetermined nor easily generalized from one context to another" (Edstrom 2009, 14), Finnish teachers are rightly trusted to make value-based language policy decisions in classroom situations. It seems that context ultimately justifies language policies as much as do theories of learning or approaches to teaching.

Thus the objectives of EFL teaching determine classroom language policies and codeswitching use. The Finnish curriculum's notion "English is used as much as possible" (FNCC 2014, e.g., 14.4.3) reveals the flexibility of language teaching to create learning environments and collaborative processes that may require L1 use. In addition, the move since 2001 towards a concept of "plurilingualism" also impacts on language teaching so that the learner "does not keep these languages and cultures in strictly separated mental compartments, but rather builds up a communicative competence to which all knowledge and experience of language contributes and in which languages interrelate and interact" (Council of Europe 2001, 4).

In Finland, multi-layered, transversal competences and objectives lead to teacher interpretation and teaching autonomy. Coupled with a strongly research-based professional development culture, this should ensure that language policy decisions are appropriate and timely. Although more research on this topic will support an optimisation of classroom language choice, mentor teachers such as those in this study have a significant impact on the next generation of EFL

teachers in Finland. This thesis has reported their language policies and their justification for them, so that I offer here a concise picture of the possible influence of mentor teachers on future EFL teaching.

In conclusion, a cocktail of numerous, diverse factors influence the classroom language policies of Finnish EFL teachers. In addition to personal values and background influences, they report that language learning objectives justify an English-only approach, although teachers may still resort to L1 to ensure student understanding. Wide-ranging teaching objectives and classroom realities also lead to codeswitching, as well as planned L1 use. The teachers described a general transition towards reduced L1 use as students advance in age and language level. However, the necessities of testing and textbook use require the continued role of L1 in Finnish EFL lower and upper secondary school classrooms.

7. References

Anthony, E. M. 1963. “Approach, method and technique”. *English Language Teaching,* 17: 63–67.

Arnett, K. 2013. “Using the First Language and Code Switching in Second Language Classrooms” In Chapelle, C. A. (ed.), *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics* [https://doi.org/10.1002/9781405198431.wbeal1240.pub2]. Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Árva,V. and Medgyes, P. 2000. “Native and non-native teachers in the classroom”. *System,* 28(3): 355–372.

Bayyurt, Y. and Akcan, S (eds.) 2015, *Current Perspectives on Pedagogy for English As a Lingua Franca*. De Gruyter: Berlin/Boston.

Brevik, L. M, and Rindal U. 2020. “Language Use in the Classroom: Balancing Target Language Exposure with the Need for Other Languages”. *TESOL quarterly* 54(4): 925–953.

Canagarajah, S. 2013. *Translingual Practice*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Carroll, J. B. 1965. “The prediction of success in intensive foreign language training”. In Glaser, R. (ed.), *Training, Research, and Education* (pp. 87-136). New York: Wiley.

Carroll, J.B. 1975. *The Teaching of French as a Foreign Language in Eight Countries*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Cook, V. 2001. “Using the first language in the classroom”. *Canadian Modern Language Review,* 57: 402–23.

Cook, G. 2008. “An unmarked improvement: Using translation in ELT”. In Beavon, B. (ed.) *IATEFL 2007 Aberdeen Conference Selections* (pp. 76–86). Canterbury: IATEFL.

Cook, G. 2010. *Translation in Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Copland, F. and Neokleous, G. 2011. “L1 to teach L2: Complexities and contradictions”. *ELT Journal*, 65(3): 270–280.

Council of Europe. 2001. *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, teaching, assessment*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Day, E.M. and Shapson, S.1996. *Studies in Immersion Education.* Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Edstrom, A. 2009. “Teacher reflection as a strategy for evaluating L1/L2 use in the classroom”. *Babylonia*, 1: 12–15.

Ellis, R. 1986. *Second Language Acquisition and Language Pedagogy.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Ellis, R. and Shintani, N. 2014. *Exploring language pedagogy through second language acquisition research.* Abingdon: Routledge.

Farrell, T. S. C. and Jacobs, G. M. 2010. *Essentials for Successful Language Teaching*. London: Continuum.

Feez, S. 1998. *Text-Based Syllabus Design.* Sydney: National Centre for English Teaching and Research.

Finnish Education Evaluation Centre. 2015. *Outcomes of Language Learning at The End of Basic Education in 2013*. Information Materials 2015:1.

Finnish National Agency For Education. 2019. *Facts Express: What Languages Do Pupils Study in Basic Education?* 1C/2019.

Finnish National Board of Education. 2014. *National Core Curriculum for Basic Education 2014*. Porvoon Kirjakeskus.

Finnish National Board of Education. 2020. *National Core Curriculum for General Upper Secondary Education 2019: the National Core Curriculum for General Upper Secondary Education Intended for Young People.* Helsinki: Finnish National Agency for Education.

Flick, U. 2014. *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Data Analysis*. Sage Publications.

Glaser, B. G., and Strauss, A. L. 1967. *The Discovery of Grounded Theory : Strategies for Qualitative Research*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.

Hall, G. 2016. *The Routledge Handbook of English Language Teaching*. London: Routledge.

Hall, G. and Cook, G. 2013. *Own-language Use in ELT: Exploring Global Practices and Attitudes in ELT*. London: British Council.

Inan-Karagul, B. and Yuksel, D. 2014. *Teaching Language Skills.* New York: Nova Science Publishers.

Irie, K. and Stewart, A. 2011. *Realizing Autonomy: Practice and Reflection in Language Education Contexts.* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Jaatinen, R. and Saarivirta, T. 2014. "The Evolution of English Language Teaching during Societal Transition in Finland – A mutual relationship or a distinctive process?". *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 39(11): 29–44.

Kerr, P. 2016. "Questioning 'English-Only' Classrooms: Own-Language Use in ELT." In Hall, G. (ed.) *The Routledge Handbook of English Language Teaching* (pp. 531–544). Routledge.

Kim, H. K. and Yoon, B. 2012. *Teachers' Roles in Second Language Learning: Classroom Applications of Sociocultural Theory*. Charlotte, N.C: Information Age Pub.

Krashen, S. 1981. *Second Language Acquisition and Second Language Learning*. New York: Pergamon.

Krashen, S. 1982. *Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition*. New York: Pergamon.

Krashen, S. 1985. *The Input Hypothesis: Issues and Implications.* London: Longman.

Krashen, S. and Terrell, T. D. 1983. *The Natural Approach: Language Acquisition in the Classroom.* Oxford, England: Pergamon Press.

Lado, R. 1964. *Language Teaching: A Scientific Approach*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Larsen-Freeman, D. and Anderson, M. 2011. *Techniques and Principles in Language Teaching*. Third edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Laufer, B. and Girsai, N. 2008. "Form-Focused Instruction in Second Language Vocabulary Learning: A Case for Contrastive Analysis and Translation." *Applied linguistics,* 29(4): 694–716.

Lee, J. H. 2012. "Reassessment of English-only approach in EFL context in view of young learners' attitudes, language proficiency,and vocabulary knowledge". *Multilingual Education.* 12(2): 1–11.

Leppänen, S. 2007. "Youth Language in Media Contexts: Insights into the Functions of English in Finland." *World Englishes,* 26(2): 149–169.

Levine, G. S. 2003. "Student and instructor beliefs and attitudes about target language use, first language use, and anxiety: Report of a questionnaire study". *Modern Language Journal,* 87: 343–64.

Levine, G. S. 2014. "Principles for code choice in the foreign language classroom: A focus on grammaring". *Language Teaching*, 47(3): 332–348.

Long, M. H. 2015. *Second Language Acquisition and Task-Based Language Teaching*. First Edition. Malden (MA): Wiley-Blackwell.

Macaro, E. 2000. "Issues in target language teaching", in K. Field (ed.) *Issues in modern foreign languages teaching* (pp. 171–189). Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.

Macaro, E. 2001. "Analysing student teachers' codeswitching in foreign language classrooms: Theories and decision making". *The Modern Language Journal*, 85(4): 531– 548.

Macaro, E. 2005. "Codeswitching in the L2 classroom: A communication and learning strategy". In Llurda, E. (ed.) *Non-native Language Teachers: Perceptions, Challenges and Contributions to the Profession* (pp. 63–84). New York: Springer.

Mauranen, A and Ranta, E. 2009. *English as a Lingua Franca: Studies and Findings.* Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Pub.

Mauranen, A. 2012. *Exploring ELF: Academic English Shaped by Non-Native Speakers.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Menn, L. 2017. *Psycholinguistics: Introduction and Applications*. Second edition. San Diego, California: Plural Publishing.

Mouhanna, M. 2009. "Re-examining the role of L1 in the EFL classroom". *UGRU Journal,* 8: 1–19.

Niemi, H., Toom, A. and Kallioniemi, A. (eds.) 2012. *Miracle of Education: The Principles and Practices of Teaching and Learning in Finnish Schools*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Pennycook, A. 1989. "The concept of method, interested knowledge, and the politics of language teaching". *TESOL Quarterly,* 23(4): 589–618.

Piaget, J. and Gabain, M. 1930. *The Child's Conception of Physical Causality*. London: Kegan Paul.

Polio, C. and Duff, P. 1994. "Teachers' language use in university foreign language classrooms: A qualitative analysis of English and target language alternation". *Modern Language Journal*, 78: 313–26.

Richards, J. C. and Rodgers, T. S. 2001. *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching.* Cambridge, GBR: Cambridge University Press.

Swain, M. 1985. "Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in development". In Gass, S. and Madden, C. (eds.), *Input in Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 235–256). Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.

Swain, M. and Lapkin, S. 2000. "Task-based second language learning: The use of the first language". *Language Teaching Research*, 4(3): 251–274.

Turnbull, M., and Arnett, K. 2002. "Teachers' use of the target language and first languages in second and foreign language classrooms". *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 22: 204–18.

Turnbull, M. and Dailey-O'Cain, J. 2009. *First Language Use in Second and Foreign Language Learning*. Bristol, England: Multilingual Matters.

Üstünel, E. and Seedhouse, P. 2005. "Why that, in that language, right now? Code-switching and pedagogical focus". *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 15: 302– 325.

van Lier, L. 1996. *Interaction in the Language Curriculum: Awareness, Autonomy and Authenticity*. London: Longman.

Vygotski, L. S., Hanfmann, E. and Vakar G. 1962. *Thought and Language*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.

Willis, J. 1996. "A flexible framework for task-based learning". In Willis, J. and Willis, D. (eds.), *Challenge and Change in Language Teaching* (pp. 235–256). Oxford: Heinemann.

8. Appendices

8.1. Consent and Data Protection forms

Consent form

Project title: *Teachers' language policy in Finnish EFL classrooms*
Investigator: Lee Garner, MA English Studies, University of Helsinki

This consent form is for taking part in the **Teachers' language policy in Finnish EFL classrooms** *(researcher: Lee Garner). In the following text, I will describe the aims and procession of my research. Please read the following information, do not hesitate to ask if you need clarification, and consider if you have the possibility to take part in this study.*

Purpose of the research

The aim of this project is to determine the classroom language policies of EFL teachers in Finland. Information obtained by video-recorded interview will be transcribed and used to describe these language choices and discuss their foundations and effectiveness.

Data collection and participation

Semi-structured interviews of 6 (or more) English teachers. Interviews conducted and video-recorded through Zoom.

The participation is voluntary and the participants are free to withdraw at any time.

Anonymity and data storage

The interviews will be video recorded, and the recordings will be transcribed, translated (if needed) and stored electronically. Passages from the transcripts can be used in the Master's thesis. Your identity as an informant will be protected: any documents labelled with your name or personally-identifying information will be anonymized.

Participant's Permission

I have read the consent form and conditions of this study. I have had the opportunity to discuss the consent form with the investigator. Any questions I have about this research have been answered to my satisfaction. I hereby acknowledge the above and give my voluntary consent.

Please choose the specific conditions of your participation below by selecting the options and sign the form.

- I will take part in the study. ☐

Signature _____ Date _____

Name _____

If you have any further questions about this study, please contact:

Name: Lee Garner
Email: lee.garner@helsinki.fi

v1/2020
DATA PROTECTION NOTICE FOR SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH
General Data Protection Regulation of the EU
Articles 12–14
Date: 1.12.2020

Information on the processing of personal data in the research project entitled

Teachers' language policy in Finnish EFL classrooms

The research project entitled *Teachers' language policy in Finnish EFL classrooms* involves processing of personal data. The purpose of this data protection notice is to provide information on the personal data to be processed, from where they are obtained and how they are used. Detailed information on the rights of data subjects will be provided at the end of this notice.

Your participation in the research project and provision of personal data are voluntary. If you do not wish to participate in the project or you wish to withdraw from it, you can do so without negative consequences.

1. Data Controller

University of Helsinki
Address: PO Box (Fabianinkatu 33), 00014 University of Helsinki, Finland

2. Contact person and principal investigator

Contact person in matters concerning the research project:
Name: Lee Garner
Faculty/department/unit:
Address:
Phone:
Email: lee.garner@helsinki.fi

Principal investigator:
Name: Lee Garner
Email: lee.garner@helsinki.fi

3. Contact details of the data protection officer

You can contact the University of Helsinki data protection officer via email at tietosuoja@helsinki.fi.

4. Description of the research project and the purpose of processing personal data

The aim of this project is to determine the classroom language policies of EFL teachers in Finland. Information obtained by video-recorded interview will be transcribed and used to describe these language choices and theorise on their foundations and effectiveness.

5. Personal data included in the research data

Direct identifier, such as faces and voices, will be used only during the writing of this research and will not appear in the finished study. Names, dates-of-birth, addresses will not be included in this research. Indirect identifiers, such as school or grades taught may be included. This data is for the use of this study only.

6. Sensitive personal data

No special categories of personal data (i.e., sensitive data), as defined in Article 9 of the GDPR, will be processed in this research.

7. Lawful basis for processing personal data

Personal data are processed on the following basis (Article 6(1) of the GDPR): performance of a task carried out in the public interest: scientific or historical research purposes or statistical purposes.

If the processing of personal data is based on the research subject's consent, he or she can withdraw that consent at any time. The withdrawal of consent does not affect the lawfulness of processing based on consent before its withdrawal.

8. Recipients of data

Recipients known at the time of drawing up the data protection notice:
University of Helsinki

9. Transfer of data to countries outside the European Economic Area

Data will not be transferred to countries outside the European Economic Area.

10. Automated decision-making

The research project involves no automated decision-making that has a significant effect on data subjects.

11. Protection of personal data

Personal data included in the research dataset will be processed and kept protected so that only those who need the data can access them.

The data processed in data systems will be protected using the following:
Username and password

No physical material will be stored.

Processing direct identifiers:
Direct identifiers will be removed during the analysis stage and kept separate from the analysed research data.

12. Duration of the processing of personal data in this research project:

The data will be kept for the duration of this study. Project timeline: completion May 2021.

13. Processing of personal data when the research project ends

The research data will be deleted.

14. Rights of data subjects and derogations from those rights

The contact person in matters related to research subjects' rights is the person stated in section 2 of this notice.

Rights of data subjects

Under the General Data Protection Regulation, data subjects have the following rights:

- Right of access to their data
- Right to rectification of their data
- Right to the erasure of their data and to be forgotten
- Right to the restriction of processing of their data
- Right to data portability
- Right to object to the processing of their data
- Right not to be subject to automated decision-making

However, data subjects cannot exercise all their rights in all circumstances. The circumstances are affected by, for example, the legal basis for processing personal data.

Further information on the rights of data subjects in various circumstances can be found on the website of the Data Protection Ombudsman: https://tietosuoja.fi/en/what-rights-do-data-subjects-have-in-different-situations.

If data subjects cannot be identified
If the processing of personal data for research purposes does not require the identification of the data subject and if the controller is unable to identify the data subject, the right to access, rectify, erase and restrict the use of personal data, as well as any notification obligations and the right to data portability do not apply unless the data subject provides additional data enabling their identification (Article 11 of the GDPR).

Derogations from rights

The General Data Protection Regulation and the Finnish Data Protection Act enable derogations from certain rights of data subjects if personal data are processed for the purposes of scientific research and the rights are likely to render impossible or seriously impair the achievement of the research purposes.

The need for derogations from the rights of data subjects will always be assessed on a case-by-case basis.

Right to appeal
If you consider that the processing of your personal data has been carried out in breach of data protection laws, you have the right to appeal to the Office of the Data Protection Ombudsman.

Contact details:

Office of the Data Protection Ombudsman
Street address: Ratapihantie 9, 6th floor, 00520 Helsinki
Postal address: PO Box 800, 00521 Helsinki
Phone (switchboard): 029 56 66700
Fax: 029 56 66735
Email: tietosuoja(at)om.fi

8.2. Interview guide

Interview guide

CHOICE… USE… JUSTIFICATION

OPENING
purpose to find out about language use in EFL classrooms
half an hour
confidentiality, only my use, identity protected in thesis.
help OUR professional development and reflection

YOUR BACKGROUND
grades and levels taught now and in past
years of experience, other subjects, qualifications

WHAT LANGUAGE POLICY ("rules")?
In which situations do you use which languages in your classrooms?
Which language do you speak most?
What are your thoughts about using Finnish?
How do you encourage students to use English?
How do you maintain your policy?
How strict?
*Is there a difference in your language use for speaking, listening, reading, writing? online?!
What do you think is the common policy on this in EFL in Finland?

WHY LANGUAGE POLICY?
Why do you use English and Finnish the way that you do?
What influenced your use of those languages in the classroom?
Approach / theory?
Experience / trial and error?
Teacher persona / role? Values? Drama?
Own language learning?
Common sense? Intuition?
Other influences? Core / school curriculum? Theories of learning / didactics (in general)?

CODE-SWITCHING AND EXCEPTIONS
In what situations do you change to Finnish?
Own English skills?
What do you think of translation exercises?
Is authentic language important?
How does age or level affect your language choice?
What about students with another mother tongue?
Why else might you change language?

FINNISH FOR
grammar
weaker students / younger learners
classroom management / motivation
because understanding is so important
to check text comprehension

How often do you think about these issues? Reassess your methods?

CLOSING
Thanks? Questions?

8.3. Transcription conventions: ELFA Transcription Guide, 2004)*

ELFA Transcription Guide (7/2004)

1. Transcription

Utterances	
Utterance begins:	<S1>
Utterance ends:	</S1>
Speakers	
Unidentified speaker:	<SU>
Uncertain speaker identification:	<SU-1>
Several simultaneous speakers (usually laughter or sth):	<SS>
Uncertain transcription:	(text)
Unintelligible speech:	(xx)
Laughter:	@@
Spoken laughing:	@text@
Pauses	
Brief pause while speaking 2-3 sec.:	,
Pause 3-4 sec.:	.
Pause 5 sec. or longer, rounded up to the nearest sec.:	<P: 05>
Overlapping speech (approximate, shown to the nearest word, words not split by overlap tags):	[text]
Backchannelling:	<S1> mhm </S1> <S2> okay </S2>
Hesitations	
/öö/	er
/(ö)m/	erm
/aa/	ah

Capital letters: only in acronyms: NATO, EU etc.

Numbers as numbers (10,000, 1932, 16), except those smaller than 10 (two or three, the second time, etc.)

Names of participants:	<NAME>
Nonsense words:	<SIC> text </SIC>
Spelling out a word or acronym etc, as letters:	T-U-C, V-W
Reading aloud:	<READING> text </READING>
Switching into a foreign language: (if it's a long stretch, say, of Swedish, no need to transcribe it all)	<FOREIGN> text </FOREIGN>

* These conventions were used for transcription, although they do not appear in this thesis report. Interview transcripts are not published to ensure participant anonymity.

Other events which affect the interpretation or comprehension of what is being said:

<PREPARING OVERHEAD 1:23>
<WRITING ON BLACKBOARD>
<APPLAUSE>
<WHISPERING>
<DISC / TRACK / FILE / CD CHANGE>

Coughing, sighing, gasping, etc., if the speaker coughs etc. while speaking and this affects the situation or flow of speech (but NOT if other participants cough or sneeze, etc):

<COUGH>
<GASP>

2. Event Descriptions

At the beginning of each document

Between angular brackets (NB angular brackets both at the beginning and at the end of the section)

<TITLE
ACADEMIC DOMAIN (e.g. humanities, social sciences, technological sciences)
DISCIPLINE
EVENT TYPE
FILE ID
NOTES
RECORDING DURATION
RECORDING DATE
RECORDING
TRANSCRIBING
RECHECKING
PROOFREADING
NUMBER OF SPEAKERS
NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS
SPEAKER CATEGORIES>

2.1 Labelling Files (FILE ID)

University degree program recordings (Tampere University or Tampere University of Technology): U

Conference recordings: C

Degree programs

Seminar

Seminar presentation: SEMP
Seminar discussion: SEMD

Lecture

Monologic lecture:	LEC
Lecture discussion (more than one or two clarification questions):	LECD

Doctoral thesis defence

defence presentation:	DEFP
defence discussion:	DEFD

Conferences

Conference presentation (section paper):	PRE
Discussion following paper (more than one or two clarification questions):	DIS
Conference plenary:	PLE

Other event types

e.g. colloquium, panel discussion, guest lecture, special teaching practice, undergraduate seminar, etc.

(specification into the "notes" in event descriptions):	OTH

Running numbering (2 digits) by event type, in the order of transcribing

Independent file:	0

File is part of another event (conference, research seminar, etc) of the same event type: A,B,C...

Examples:

Seminar presentation	USEMP01A
Seminar discussion	USEMD01B
Lecture	ULEC010
Colloquium	UOTH010
Conference presentation	CPRE01A
Conference discussion (following paper)	CDISC01B
Conference plenary talk	CPLE01C
Conference panel discussion	COTH01D

2.2 Speaker Categories

Native speaker status (the speaker's native language)

Academic Role

Students up to BA, or first 3 years:	UNDERGRADUATE
Students doing their MA/MSc or 4th year +:	MASTER'S STUDENT
Doctoral students:	RESEARCH STUDENT
Teaching staff other than professors:	JUNIOR STAFF
Professors:	SENIOR STAFF
Unknown academic role:	UNKNOWN

Gender

Age

2.3 Example

<TITLE: Social History of Finland
ACADEMIC DOMAIN: SOCIAL SCIENCES
DISCIPLINE: HISTORY
EVENT TYPE: LECTURE, DISCUSSION
File ID: ULECD020
NOTES:

RECORDING DURATION: 75MIN 29SEC

RECORDING DATE: 28.11.2002

RECORDING: ANULIINA TURUNEN

TRANSCRIBING: ANULIINA TURUNEN

RECHECKING: ELINA RANTA

PROOFREADING:

NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS: UNKNOWN

NUMBER OF SPEAKERS: 3

S1: NATIVE-SPEAKER STATUS: FINNISH; ACADEMIC ROLE: SENIOR STAFF GENDER: MALE; AGE: 31-50

S2: NATIVE-SPEAKER STATUS: POLISH; ACADEMIC ROLE: MASTER'S STUDENT; GENDER: FEMALE; AGE: 24-30

S3: NATIVE-SPEAKER STATUS: JAPANESE; ACADEMIC ROLE: UNDERGRADUATE; GENDER: FEMALE; AGE: 17-23>